

# AMERICA

## A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

VOL. L. No. 5  
WHOLE No. 1258

November 4, 1933

PRICE 10 CENTS  
\$4.00 A YEAR

### CONTENTS

<b>EDITORIALS</b> —Note and Comment.....	97-101
<b>TOPICS OF INTEREST:</b> Campaigning for Tolerance in Texas by John Joseph Gorrell, K.H.S., G.O.S.L. — Hollywood—A State of Mind by Helena M. Kay—The German Center Party: 1871-1890 by Joseph T. Durkin, S.J.—An Open Letter to M. Litvinov by Wilfrid Parsons, S.J.....	102-108
<b>POETRY:</b> Rainbow's End.....	104
<b>EDUCATION:</b> Catholic Education Week by Paul L. Blakely, S.J.....	109-110
<b>SOCIOLOGY:</b> Beet Sugar and Oppression by Arthur E. Gleason, S.J.....	110-112
<b>WITH SCRIP AND STAFF</b> by The Pilgrim.....	112
<b>LITERATURE:</b> The Materials of Fiction by Francis X. Connolly.....	113-114
<b>BOOK REVIEWS</b> ....114-116..... <b>COMMUNICATIONS</b> ....117..... <b>CHRONICLE</b> ..	118-120

### If Recognition of Russia Comes

NEWSPAPER writers have jumped to the conclusion generally that the exchange of letters between the President of the United States and the President of the Central Executive Committee of the U. S. S. R., or Soviet Russia, was a mere formality leading inevitably to recognition. Subsequent comment has been based on that conclusion.

The facts do not bear out such a conclusion. President Roosevelt, in his letter, very carefully stresses that the meeting will be merely for the discussion of the "serious difficulties" that exist between the two countries. The text of the two letters, certainly agreed on by both parties beforehand, contains no inkling of a commitment on either side, and this must also certainly have been deliberate, however much Russia might have liked to include one.

It is obvious, therefore, that in the coming discussions the President has chosen, not the role of an advocate of recognition, but that of an expounder and defender of American rights, policies and aims. This involves, of course, the implication that if in the course of the discussions it becomes clear that these rights, aims, and policies can be safeguarded, then recognition will follow. There will then be no longer any reason for withholding it.

It would be going too fast to conclude lightly that, if that is the case, then recognition is sure, because the difficulties are sure to be solved. The only sensible conclusion is that the President should feel that he has behind him a country united with him in his rightful demands, as its elected representative, for the fulfilment of conditions that must be fulfilled before recognition can be granted safely.

As far as Catholics and many others are concerned in their religious feelings, the outside world can gauge their

attitude correctly by a comparison with that of others if it were at present a question of beginning diplomatic relations with Nazi Germany which persecutes radicals, pacifists, Communists, Socialists, and Jews. It is obvious that there would be a great outcry in the press against any recognition at all except on condition that this persecution cease. The outrages against religion and religious people in Russia have been much more severe and prolonged than they were in Germany. Even the so-called "cold" pogrom, or civil and business boycott, in Germany does not surpass that at present existing in Russia against Christians.

It is clear, then, that as a statesman the President will feel obliged to lay this point of view of so many of our citizens, Catholics and others, before the Russian delegate. Even those who are most emphatically in favor of recognition should desire this, if they are to hope that future relations with Russia are not going to be bedeviled by the same kind of angry recriminations that now bedevil our relations with Germany. Indeed, if relations are to have a chance of success, Russia itself should see this point.

We are not urging this, therefore, as Catholics, but as sincere friends of the President, and as Americans who wish to see that the Administration is not embarrassed later on by the consequences of an act that will involve it in serious reactions.

The same point of view animates us in regard to another matter that is set forth more fully elsewhere in this issue in an open letter to M. Litvinov. It cannot be argued that the suppression of the Third International is an internal policy that concerns Russia alone, and with which we have no right to meddle. It is an international policy, and concerns every country in the world. We have only to look to China, and in a lesser degree, to Japan, Germany, and England, to be convinced of this.

Here, too, the success of recognition, and the degree

with which it will ultimately be approved, depends on what is done now. It is no answer to say that propaganda will cease, and that we have no need to fear it anyhow. It will not cease, and we will have need to fear it enormously, as long as there exists among us a political party which is an integral part of the Moscow International and takes its orders and funds from it for the avowed purpose of bringing this country's Government within the orbit of a worldwide Communist regime. How can our relations with Russia be satisfactory if we will have constantly to protest to Moscow, as England and France have done?

At this writing there is an immense hubbub over the formation of Nazi branches in this country. Reprehensible as these branches are, they are only following the example of the Communists, who have had such branches for years. We have a chance right now to see to it, before any relations begin, that the connection of these branches with their home Government is broken once for all by the dissolution of the Third International.

### After Prohibition?

THE retiring president of the W. C. T. U. recently gave an interview to the press in which she expressed her opinion on the Rockefeller plan for liquor control. "What Mr. Rockefeller wants is moderation," said the lady, "but the W. C. T. U. can't and won't stand for moderation." In these few words Mrs. Boole gives the reason why the country is about to repeal the Eighteenth Amendment. It has had enough of associations which have inflicted on the country a mass of legislation reflecting their conviction that moderation is not a virtue but a vice.

The chief value of the Rockefeller survey lies in the fact that it will probably center attention on the need of a workable Federal and State code of control. When that is obtained, much has been achieved, but not nearly enough. The Prohibitionists were wrong in thinking that total abstinence could be imposed upon all by statute; Mr. Rockefeller and his group will be no less wrong in thinking that the temperate use of alcoholic beverages can be generally secured by the same means. It is time for us to wake up to the plain truth that for the regulation of a habit, innocuous in itself but liable to abuse, something more pertinent than statutes and codes is necessary. By punishing offenders, the law tends to suppress gross external violations of the public peace and order, but it does not build up in the individual resistance against influences which, if yielded to, will make him an offender. Law is necessary, but even more necessary is self-control in the individual, and that can be built up only through education and, chiefly, religion.

The task which now devolves upon the conscientious educator is more difficult than that which he, or his predecessor, undertook a generation ago. Fifteen years of disorder and intemperance have had an effect on the young people now in our colleges, and even in our high schools, which cannot easily be beaten back. But the

complexity of the work which the teacher faces ought to be a challenge to his zeal and ingenuity. He must assess methods, and find out which are best fitted to teach our young people temperance. Temperance in the use of all things has always been taught in our Catholic schools, but in view of the black harvest which nationwide Prohibition has reaped, may it not be necessary to lay the stress, for a time, at least, on temperance in the use of alcoholic beverages?

Whether this is to be done through total-abstinence societies, popular many years ago in parishes and in some colleges, or, indirectly, through sodalities and other religious organizations now existing, or the personal influence of the teachers, is a question to be solved by our educational authorities. Some experienced teachers think that the total-abstinence society, however useful it may have been in the past, is apt to repel the young person of today. There is general agreement, however, on the principle that the best policy is to propose either total abstinence, or temperate use, as an exercise of self-denial based upon a supernatural motive.

Whatever the means adopted, we are persuaded that Catholic educators will not lose the opportunity now presented to them. Suitable legislation for the control of the traffic is wholly necessary, but bitter experience has taught all but the most fanatical that legislation alone is not sufficient.

### The Parole

AFTER listening to the Chicago police, and making his own investigation in that district, Senator Cope-land, chairman of the Senate sub-committee on racketeering, declared, "The parole system does not seem to work." The Senator is expressing an opinion which many of his fellow-citizens share.

Yet the system, as such, has merit. The first end of punishment is to restore the balance of justice, disturbed by the law breaker's conduct. If the State can also rehabilitate the prisoner, it achieves another end of punishment. Hence, when the convict shows by his conduct in prison that he is prepared to lead a law-abiding and useful career in society, the State may properly release him. He has paid at least part of the debt due to society, and for reasons of the common good, the State may forgive what remains unpaid, or, rather, collect it from him as a worth-while asset to society. It was to achieve this secondary end of punishment that the parole system was devised.

Unfortunately, the system is seldom given a chance to show its merits. At the present time it suffers from two drawbacks, either of which would suffice to ruin it. The first is partisan political control, and the second, flowing directly from the first, is incompetent or dishonest administrators. Under favorable conditions, the parole system can be made an agency of real social value, but as conditions actually are in many jurisdictions, its chief value is to the criminal. The deterrent effect of punishment is almost wholly lost in the maze of our criminal



procedure. The criminal's chance of being apprehended is small, and his chance of indictment and conviction is smaller. When loosely governed parole boards allow him to believe that, even if convicted, he will spend no lengthy period behind the bars, the deterrent value of the police and the criminal courts is practically negligible.

The first step in reform is, of course, the elimination of the politically controlled parole board. It is also the most difficult step, but where it cannot be taken, the parole system will, on the whole, do more harm than good. In the next place, the parole should be restricted to the first offender, and even then only when there is solid reason to suppose that he has reformed. The appearance of paroled offenders in the criminal courts shows that in many cases, little or no examination was made when parole was granted. Unless these reforms are instituted, the public will continue to think, with justice, that "the parole system does not work."

## Lynching

ONE of the gravest indications of the disintegration of social morality is the increasing disregard for human life in this country. There are more murders in the United States, and more unpunished murderers, than in any country in the world, and there are more lynchings. Lynching is murder, but an aggravated form of murder, since it includes open rebellion against the constituted authority in the State. And that rebellion is also rebellion against Almighty God, in whose Name the State promotes justice.

Probably the high mark of rebellion, brutality, and obscenity was reached in the lynching of a Negro some weeks ago in Maryland. The *Baltimore Sun* is hardly guilty of over-statement in writing that this crime was "the lynching of civilization in this State." But what will be done to show that the State resents this crime, and is determined to bring the guilty to justice? Shall we witness once more the old show on the part of the officials, the customary declaration that after diligent investigation no culprit can be discovered, the temporary flare-up of indignation, and the subsequent silence of baffled officials, to be followed shortly thereafter by another lynching? "This time," writes the editor of the *Sun*, the people of Maryland "will not tolerate the dodging of responsibility."

But the "dodging" seems to be taking its usual course. Twenty-one witnesses, summoned by the coroner, have deposed that although they saw the mob in action, they were unable to recognize any individual. It is said, however, that the State police have the names of seven or eight of the mob, and "speedy action" is promised. For that action, good citizens of every State, as well as of the State of Maryland, will wait—a reasonable time. Will their expectations be satisfied?

It is an undeniable fact that lynching is the safest form of murder in a country in which every kind of murder is fairly safe. Lynchers may have been detected somewhere at some time in the past, and executed for their

crime, but if so, the fact has escaped our memory. As a general rule, both county and State officials, because of inefficiency or of unwillingness, have failed to vindicate the State against this crime. Will Maryland follow this custom? It is said that no legal responsibility rests upon either the Governor of Maryland, or upon any county official, except the sheriff. However, this does not mean that the State is unable to make any investigation of the crime. Maryland here has her opportunity. If it takes ten years to discover the lynchings, let Maryland take ten years. If additional legislation is necessary, let Governor Ritchie submit it to the legislature.

The lynching occurred in what the *New York Times* correctly describes as "a lamentably backward region." Should this crime go unpunished, the natives will hold themselves justified, and proceed to another at the first opportunity. The State must vindicate her sovereignty. This is all the more necessary since, as is credibly reported, not a few of the leading citizens of that district are disposed to look upon lynching with toleration, if not with approval.

Along with a thorough investigation of this crime, it should be possible for the State to provide for a social and economic survey of this backward region. It is generally true that lynchings take place in districts noted for illiteracy, and in which the dominant religion is hatred of Negroes, Catholics, and Jews. Quite commonly gross immorality is coupled with this counterfeit religion, to form a community in which civilization hardly exists. There are exceptions, but the picture is general enough to serve as a type. No real study, of the character here suggested, has to our knowledge ever been made in any State infested with this most dangerous form of violence. Maryland has an opportunity, unfortunately, made to her hand. Will she take it?

## Unfair Competition

THE refusal of employers to pay a living wage is now generally recognized as one of the worst forms of unfair competition. Under the Recovery Act something has been done to eliminate it, but the practice will doubtless continue until proper legislation, supported by public opinion, puts it beyond the pale.

Another form, not so commonly recognized, is the company union. Theoretically, the company union is an association of workers in a given shop, without any affiliation with any trade union or Federation. Probably there are isolated cases in which the company union is the result of a free agreement between employer and employ, but usually this so-called "union" is foisted upon the worker by fraud or coercion. Its chief purpose is not the protection of the rights of all parties to the compact, but the protection of the interests of the employer, even at the expense of those of the workers. When employment is given on condition that the worker join no labor group not approved by the employer, we have the "yellow-dog" contract, held by New York and other States to be contrary to public policy.

One famous instance of the working of the typical company union is found in the case of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks against the Texas and New Orleans Railway. In 1927, the Brotherhood asked for an increase in wages. In the western part of the system, the case was arbitrated, and the Brotherhood won. The officials in the eastern section at once began to organize a company union. "If we are successful," wrote the vice-president of the road to his superior officer, "I am satisfied that we can make a settlement at a cost not to exceed \$75,000 per year." On the basis of the award in the western section the increase in salary costs would have been \$340,000.

The Brotherhood resisted the formation of the company union, and won their case in every court, including the Supreme Court of the United States. Chief Justice Hughes held that under the Railway Act, the workers were entitled to organize their unions without interference from or coercion by their employers. If this legislation could be extended to all employers one prolific source of disorder in the industrial world would be removed. Whether the Recovery Act can stop up this source remains to be seen. The intention of Administrator Johnson and of his counsel, Donald Richberg, is plain enough, but the point in issue is the intention of the Act. On that point there is divergence of opinion.

### Note and Comment

#### The Home and School Association

AT the eleventh annual convention of the Catholic Rural Life Conference, in Milwaukee, October 17-19, the Rev. James Byrnes, Superintendent of Schools of the Archdiocese of St. Paul, discussed the future of the Catholic Parent-Teachers Association. Father Byrnes had himself been particularly active in promoting this important movement, which has found welcome with Catholic parents and teachers alike. The question of the relationship of the Catholic organization with the powerful National Parent-Teachers' Congress has caused some perplexity. Attempts to fit the Catholic movement into the framework of this secular organization have not been successful. Father Byrnes cut the Gordian knot by advising against any such attempts. The secular parent-teachers' movement is actuated, he explained, by an educational philosophy alien to that of Catholic school. Moreover it is being used for purposes which are not friendly to the Catholic school system; especially as a means of propagating the National Educational Association, with the latter's peculiar aims. He advocated entire dissociation from such affiliation, and suggested that the Catholic movement take the title: Catholic Home and School Association, as expressing its true nature. The suggestion met with general approval in the discussion. The Home and School Association, as outlined by Father Byrnes, will provide just the element which is needed in our Catholic educa-

tional system; a means of educating the public, and parents in particular, as to the true aims of Catholic education, thus securing that active cooperation without which Catholic schools cannot function.

#### Herriot in Russia

AN amusing story comes from Russia by way of Italy, and the authority for it is no less a person than Mussolini. It concerns the recent visit of ex-Premier Herriot to the land of soviets. Il Duce took some time out in a recent gathering of international officials to read to them out of a report from the Italian consul in, let us say, Kharkov, on the preparations made there to receive the distinguished visitor. The station was to be repaired inside and out, the façades of the houses on the street leading from the station to the hotel were to be made over, ragged children were to be kept off the streets during the visit, and as a supreme effort to impress the anti-clerical Herriot, men dressed in cassocks were to be seen frequently on the street in front of the hotel. Immediately after his departure all these measures were to be stopped. In Moscow, too, the French church was to be all fixed up. But alas, M. Herriot did not see fit even to make a visit to the church, so that was all in vain. To see whether he was really taken in by all this we shall have to wait; for he, too, is going to write a book about his visit. Malicious gossip in Paris had it that half of this book was written before he left. It would probably cause an international incident to suggest that the rest of it will be made up, as other books have been, out of Soviet hand-outs in Moscow itself. Otherwise he may get himself into accusations of plagiarism from those who have used the same stuff before. Everybody remembers Theodore Dreiser's and Mrs. Sinclair Lewis' little tiff some years ago, and the recent one between Ella Winter and Henry J. Allen.

#### New Orleans Celebrates

THERE is a peculiarly happy tradition of the Civil War preserved in the South's largest medical center. Charity Hospital in New Orleans, though an institution of State and city, has been entrusted to the care of the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul for the best part of a century. The memory of the sweet heroism of these angels of the battlefields is indelibly etched in the hearts of all Southerners of whatever creed. So it seems most natural to find these same Sisters with their flapping "cornette" ministering to the sick of our oldest and largest hospital with its 1,500 beds, angels again in another battlefield. On November 7, the city and State will publicly honor these Sisters in the person of Sister Stanislaus Malone, who for fifty years has been Superior of the community and the head and heart of this medical center. A native of Sacramento, Calif., Sister Stanislaus came to New Orleans in 1883, and her fifty years of service are like golden threads woven into the glorious history of this institution. By her wisdom and tact polished in the school of experience, her smiling optimism, unfailing humor, and



striking wit, and her saintly example of all those qualities prescribed by St. Vincent de Paul, she has been a guide, support, and inspiration to the Sisters, the medical profession, the nurses, and public officials, and an angel of mercy to all the sick and poor of New Orleans.

#### An Institute of Catholic Action

**W**HAT is included in Catholic Action? No one can yet say, since every month reveals a wider scope to this all-embracing term. The second Catholic Action week of the Archdiocese of Dubuque, celebrated in that city October 24 to 26 of this year, revealed some of the variety of "thought and action" around the "centers of sound doctrine and social activity" implied in the words of Pope Pius XI. Archbishop Beckman, in summoning the conference, stated that its comprehensive program would "constitute an institute for Catholic Action" in his Archdiocese. The three days were a marshaling of the forces of the lay apostolate in the Dubuque territory. October 24 was devoted to the Priest's Eucharistic League and the local Council of Catholic Women. Congregational singing and participation of the laity in the Liturgy, the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, parent-teacher associations; study clubs and evidence guilds; and Catholic women's clubs were discussed. The second day was devoted wholly to the problems of rural life, thus being a fitting sequel to the impressive national convention of the Catholic Rural Life Conference which took place in Milwaukee during the previous week. Many of the prominent figures in the national convention, such as Fathers Bishop, Ligutti, J. M. Campbell, spoke in Dubuque, where Msgr. Conry presided, one of the pioneers of the national organization. The third and last day was taken up by the study of the problems of social justice and charity, of the mission crusade, and the parish sodalities. Michael O'Shaughnessy spoke on the Catholic League for Social Justice. Archdiocesan charities, the St. Vincent de Paul Society, the medical missions, and the various phases of parish sodality organization were among the many other topics discussed. A Boy-Scout program was also staged. With such diocesan and regional programs becoming a part of our Catholic life under the Ordinary's leadership, the effectiveness of our national Catholic Action organizations will be indefinitely increased.

#### Meistersingers' Song Contest

**H**IS Eminence of Boston actually knew all the words. All the words to "Silver Threads Among the Gold." All the words to "Last Night the Nightingale Waked Me." To "In the Gloaming," "Mavourneen," "I Dreamt I Dwelt in Marble Halls," and maybe even to "Ta-ra-ra Boom-de-Ay." Here is a feat of memory that is simply beyond the rest of us. On those rare occasions when *we* gather round the piano to sing the sad old songs of the 'Eighties, we feel like forgetful half-wits. The best *we* can do is to come out strongly on the first line and then fill in with convenient um-pahs and dum-de-dums. "Ah, don't you remember sweet Alice, Ben Bolt, Sweet Alice and something in brown;

who tra-la-la-lah when you gave her a smile, and another line ending in frown." That's the best *we* can do. But the Cardinal is different; he knows all the words. At least, William Allen White says he does. Last week, with the Vulcania on the high seas one day out of New York, the Cardinal and the editor entered the music room. There they sat down at the Steinway and engaged in what the headline writers later called a "tune tilt." The lad from Kansas led off powerfully with "Evening Star." The prelate countered with "Pilgrims' Chorus." The Emporia sage retaliated with the "Tannhäuser Overture," but the Boston Archbishop evened up the round when he repeated the same overture with some brilliant variations. This Wagnerian bout ending in a draw, the contestants next went in for an hour of sheer nostalgia—with the editor playing and the Cardinal singing the sentimental old ballads of the Cleveland and McKinley era. It was then that the Cardinal displayed his extraordinary memory. He knew all the words. Our thanks to His Eminence and the sage for a fine lesson in urbanity, musical taste, and sheer human good feeling.

#### Silver Locks And Lilies

**H**AVE you any bubbles in your hair? The Princess Silverlocks, in the fairy tale, had very many, and that condition, according to recent historians, made her the original platinum blonde. Such, at least, seems a reasonable deduction from an essay by Dr. Logan Clendening, published in the New York *Evening Post*. Lilies and silver locks are white for the same reason: they are full of air-bubbles. The lily looks white because of the complete reflection of light "from the air-containing vacuoles between the cells of the perinath," and that scientific observation should send you post-haste to the dictionary. The first change in the hair comes when the pigment cells are removed "by phagocytic action, according to Metchnikoff," and then the hair shaft begins to fill with minute bubbles of air. If you press the lily and so expel all the air, it is no longer white, but the same process could not be used with hair. What *can* be done about white hair? Dye it, answers Dr. Clendening, or grin.

*A copy of the Index for Volume XLIX of AMERICA will be mailed to any subscriber on application to the publication office, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y.*

### AMERICA A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

WILFRID PARSONS Editor-in-Chief	JOHN LAFARGE DANIEL PARSETT
PAUL L. BLAKELY GERARD B. DONNELLY	FRANCIS X. TALBOT FLORENCE D. SULLIVAN Associate Editors
FRANCIS P. LEBUFFE, Business Manager	

SUBSCRIPTION POSTPAID  
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00  
Canada, \$4.50 - - - - Europe, \$5.00

#### Addresses:

Publication Office, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.  
Telephone: MEDallion 3-3082  
Editors' Office, 329 West 108th Street, New York, N. Y.  
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW  
*Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.*

## Campaigning for Tolerance in Texas

JOHN JOSEPH GORRELL, K.H.S., G.O.S.L.

**I**N these days of Catholic Action and the reign of the Pope of the missions, one likes to think of the preaching of the doctrines of the Catholic Church out in the open spaces to the man of the street. It is not a far-away vision to the days of 1923, 1924, and 1925 when a priest, a native Texan, was fighting the forces of evil, intolerance, bigotry, and darkness under the banner of "Campaigning against Intolerance in Texas," and yet, eight years later, it is the same old story.

Reference to the days of Ku Kluxia are always odious but the attendant evils of those unfortunate days are still with us in Texas. One of the pioneers in open-air missions to non-Catholics in the United States, Father Francis J. Ledwig, a secular priest of the Archdiocese of San Antonio, has been fighting the forces of evil all of these years.

Since his seminary days he has upheld the proposition that the chances of getting non-Catholics into a church to hear the truth about her doctrines and her teachings are ninety-nine to one against you. That being true, there is but one thing to do—carry the teachings of the Catholic Church to the street corners and highways so that all who pass shall have an opportunity to hear of the Mother Church and her teachings.

"Go ye into the whole world and teach all things whatsoever I have told you" was the command of the Divine Master. This priest has not shirked his duty. Many have argued that it is undignified for a priest to go out upon the street corner and harangue the multitudes. They say this is one of the new methods of missionary work that should be discarded. Is it new? Did not St. Peter preach upon the streets of Jerusalem and Rome? Did not St. Paul preach upon the streets of Athens? Did not the Apostles go forth into the highways and byways and preach Christ and Him crucified? This method of propagating the faith of Christ is as old as the Church itself.

The methods of this missionary priest are very simple. The week before the arrival of the missionary, a few printed placards are posted in the most frequented spots of the town and handbills are distributed, telling that a missionary priest of the Catholic Church, a native Texan, is coming to town to explain the doctrines of the Catholic Church. These bills invite one and all to come and state that no creed or organization will be attacked or even mentioned. The publicity points out that the question box will be one of the features of these meetings and all are invited to ask any reasonable questions about the teachings and practices of the Catholic Church.

Father Ledwig expounds the doctrines of the Catholic Church for seven successive evenings. He points out the evils of this present day and what precipitated the cataclysm in which we behold civilization struggling. He proves that the Church came before the Bible, explains the supposed horrors of Confession, propounds the doctrine of the Real Presence, and points out the attributes

which the true Church of Christ must have if it is following the teachings of the King of kings.

If one must carry the message of the Catholic Church to the man of the street, then the language of the common people must be used in expounding the truths of the Church. In a clear, concise, forceful manner Father Ledwig explains all of these things. His is a gospel of tolerance and of love. He has no need for stilted language, flowery sentences, and spectacular oratory.

He has had no easy task. Often under the threat of death, he has gone into villages and small towns in the out-of-the-way places in Texas to preach Christ. He has been stopped on the street during the first days of his mission in a community and asked why he wears his collar turned around. From his pulpit he has proclaimed that he is glad to be asked these questions for it is his mission to bring truth and light where darkness and ignorance have had their dwelling place. In almost every case where there has been opposition in a town upon his arrival, there has been a noticeable change of attitude before the week is over. Doubt, suspicion, and hate have been supplanted by tolerance, friendliness, and respect. Pastors of the little Catholic churches in these communities have told us that after the open-air mission to non-Catholics is over and the missionary has departed, there is an entirely different spirit in the community.

Often the question is asked: how many converts have you had? Father Ledwig's primary aim is not that. The soil must first be prepared before the seed of the Word of God may be implanted in the souls of men. Conversion cannot come where hatred and mistrust abide. Souls tossed about by every wind of doctrine must first be placed upon a firm foundation before the grace of God can begin its work. The false ideas of the forces of evil must be weeded out before one may hope to make any sizable headway in the school of salvation. The ground must be prepared, the stones of prejudice and bigotry removed, before the seed of Truth can germinate and fructify.

Some have maintained that these open-air missions are not worth while. It is held that for the effort and labor expended in them not enough returns are realized. During Father Ledwig's sixteen years of labor in the mission fields of Texas and the Southwest, many "has-been" Catholics have been brought back to the Church. Many "ought-to-be" Catholics have been saved to the Faith of their fathers. Where Father Ledwig has held missions a second and third time after some months have elapsed, larger, more enthusiastic, and more friendly audiences have greeted him upon his return engagement. I have in mind a place where only a few Catholics lived some years ago when Father Ledwig held a mission there. Today that same community is one of the best parishes in the district of missions, and has two of its sons studying for the priesthood and one of its daughters in the convent.



It cannot be denied that the rapid growth of the primitive church was due to the fact that her doctrines and practices were preached in the open air, along the highways and byways. Then came the days of travail of the Catholic Church and for three centuries she was buried in the darkness of the catacombs. In this twentieth century Catholics are still face to face with persecution. When we observe the malice in the hearts of so many well-meaning people, we find that it is due to ignorance in regard to Catholic truths and practices. The Church seems to be hardly less buried today than in the first centuries of Christianity. Our churches are frequented by few except practical Catholics. To those outside of the true Fold, the Catholic Church and her ceremonies are shrouded in mystery and there are many understandable reasons why.

What is this ignorance and prejudice that stalks abroad in our land today? If we would but pause and examine ourselves we would find, after all, that it is a sad commentary on every Catholic. If we will be honest we must strike our breast and say *mea culpa*. There is not a single Catholic who does not know what it is to have the Faith trampled upon by people laboring under false impressions implanted in their hearts by the forces of iniquity. Too few of us, both priests and laymen, are giving personal service for the eradication of prejudice and bigotry.

Never before in the history of the last thousand years has the Catholic Church faced the opportunity that lies before her today. This is particularly true in America. The consciousness of men has been aroused to the fact that, amid the turmoil of changing world conditions, through the dissensions of warring sects, among the quarrels of denominational leaders with regard to the most fundamental principles of morals and faith, one institution alone has stood forth as the embodiment of stability and power. The Catholic Church has stood serene, confident and unshaken amid the crash of man-made standards.

From a position of apologetic reserve with regard to her own rightfully achieved and splendidly deserved position in the world, the Catholic Church has swung back into the place of supreme leadership of the world's constructive thought and holds out her doctrines that have weathered every storm and are recognized as the only force that can hold the fast-crumbling fabric of civilization together until it can be re-enforced by the interweaving of those other ideals which she has so successfully applied during her long tenure in the office of builder and supervisor of the work of Christian civilization.

The history of the Catholic Church is crowded with instances in which individuals have been chosen by almighty God to father new movements for the honor and the glory of His Church. Father Ledwig, the missionary to non-Catholics in the State of Texas, has brought the Catholic church out into the open down along the Rio Grande. He has gone forth and preached Christ and Him crucified in every nook and corner, in small out-of-the-way towns and villages of the State. Under the auspices of the Knights of Columbus, and latterly the

Catholic Missionary Union, he has brought peace, harmony, and concord in these communities where ignorance and hatred had reigned. He is carrying the torch of faith to those "other sheep" who dwell in darkness, unbelief, and doubt.

## Hollywood—A State of Mind

HELENA M. KAY

TO "go Hollywood" is a very different thing indeed than to merely go to Hollywood, although in many instances the former follows closely upon the heels of the latter. To students of psychology and to laymen alike, the exotic, yet typically American in cross-section, phenomena presented by the bizarre Los Angeles suburb whence come the celluloid dramas of today's screen are well worthy of understanding consideration. This paper attempts to analyze from close first-hand association the strange metamorphoses that take place in human nature under the attrition constantly at work in Hollywood and kindred communities.

The predominant characteristic noticeable to the thoughtful observer is the highly concentrated air of make-believe, which is by no means confined to the studios. It permeates all activities, social, commercial, and civic. Thus we see business blocks in bizarre and exotic architecture, in which is clearly discernible the influence of the set builders who create the often monstrous backgrounds for the mighty "super-productions" that parade at intervals on the theater screens of the American amusement world. One may even date certain buildings on Hollywood Boulevard by their resemblance to once-current celluloid "masterpieces" that tarried awhile, and then, like snow upon the desert's dusty face, were gone. At night, throughout the year, the skies are stabbed by scintillating scimitars of light, feeling into the dusk—for what? Hollywood's method of advertising, drawing attention to the opening of some super-market, a super-restaurant, even—and this is sober truth—a super-bankruptcy sale!

Nature has been kind to Southern California, despite certain stern and salutary reminders, in the shape of earthquakes, that after all the Hand of Omnipotence is not always patiently withheld from those who would build modern Babel towers. Sunshine from May to November, with never a sprinkle of rain, with light outdoor garb practically always in use and with clear, penetrating, actinic sunrays. Blessings indeed, and so sadly often misused.

The cumulative effect of these factors is often astounding. Thus, at the several rendezvous restaurants at the cross-roads of Hollywood—Vine Street and Hollywood Boulevard—is daily enacted a spectacle that moves one to mirth, exasperation, disgust, or simply awe-struck wonder that mortals could be so silly. At the Brown Derby, one of a chain of restaurants owned by one of the chain of husbands tried and found wanting by a movie star whose brilliance has waned, a double line of worshippers, herded by a husky private detective, reaches from door

to sidewalk, gazing raptly upon the fed, vapid, and overdressed individuals who emerge after lunch, and so graciously comply with appeals to sign an autograph album. Some of the players refuse to sign their names, and opinions differ as to whether this refusal is due to churlishness, or to inability to write. The latter may sound uncharitable, but more than one of the emblazoned players verges upon absolute illiteracy. Quite an active "secondary" industry has grown up in the shape of a fluctuating market for stars' autographs, the quotations, running from a nickel and two signatures for one slightly better name to as much as a dollar for the signature of a real "big shot," often indicate the waxing or waning popularity of the star involved.

Opening nights—premieres of "mighty, mammoth, super-productions" (there are no mere pictures nowadays)—bring forth other manifestations of a curious nature. Early in the afternoon people with camp stools, apple boxes, or no seats at all patiently line the gutters leading to the Chinese Theater courtyard. Much has been written about this strange outdoor lobby. All that need here be said is that it surely represents genius of a sort, for only a genius could have succeeded in crowding so much solidified bad taste into so small a compass. Architecturally the place is a nightmare. Yet, strange to say, on a premiere night the human *curiosa* that infest its purlieus seem to bring it into a strangely true perspective drawing, à la Gustave Doré.

Huge searchlights, massed in dozens, shoot their incandescent shafts straight upward. Other skillful lighting floods the courtyard. And, as the hour draws near, the roped-off streets are patrolled by mounted policemen, whose horses snort at the clotted crowds that bask in the radiance that surrounds a premiere. And as the hour approaches the tenseness of the crowd crystallizes. A roaring loudspeaker magnifies the trifle of the speaker's voice, telling of the trifling "delight" of some fast-passing player, who pathetically seizes this opportunity to assure her public that she's still in the ring, albeit it is well known that she's dizzily slipping toward its periphery. All the ermine coats in Hollywood are on display, occupied by those who would bask in the effulgence of the opening night. About those ermine coats—most of them are rented; and late comers to the coat renters don't wear ermine. Just some more make-believe. But why continue?

In this everyday, every-hour atmosphere of make-believe, it takes all that one has of spiritual reserves to retain that sense of true values so essential to one's peace of mind. Many there are who by paying proper attention to the spiritual factors remain on even keel; but these are by no means unaware of the perils that surround them.

With so many studios, so many actors, concentrated in so comparatively small an area, with the keen, cut-throat competition for the jobs there are, with the ceaseless grind of studio politics and the necessity for sycophantic lip service, a bewildering atmosphere of unreality akin to a half-remembered childish nightmare pervades the daily life of Hollywood. We hear several actors, at

a sidewalk's edge, talking, trying to out-vie, out-lie each other. And the stupefying feature is this: each one knows that the other is lying, but tolerantly—if not patiently—listens, knowing that the talker will eventually take his turn as listener to tales of huge salary, exploits, or prospects of those who listened to him: seekers after glory, even though it be only in their own imagination—and one wonders only at the blindness of the vision which sets such store by its tinsel.

Numbers of the mysterious suicides that have startled Hollywood in the last ten years can undoubtedly be laid to the tragic sense of loneliness, of futility, of emptiness, which besets those of deeper thought habit in moments of quietude. Many apparently prosperous and happy members of the picture colony have mystified their intimates by violently ending their lives. From talks with more than one of these unhappy souls before their tragically unexpected "stepping through the door," the writer heard bitter, hopeless comment on the futility of the mad, squirrel-cage merry-go-round in which they were whirling, although no inkling of imminent self-destruction was given. The impulse, when yielded to, is almost invariably in an unforeseen moment of sudden black depression, when no doubt the true worthlessness of what they have sought and found is borne upon them in an overwhelming realization.

There is, however, another and happier manifestation of Hollywoodiana. There are several thousands of unknown and obscure people—players of small parts, staff writers who plod through an eight-hour day behind a desk in a tiny pigeonhole, technicians and manual workers, who have no desire for the hectic whirlings of the spotlight moths. They find a consolation which brings a steadier happiness in the spiritual values which, even in Hollywood, abound for all who desire them. Evidence of this is gratifyingly manifested by the attendance at Mass daily and Sunday at Blessed Sacrament Church, Christ the King, St. Victor's, and the Church of the Precious Blood. All bear evidence of and give eloquent tribute to a faith that burns as steadily as the altar lights amidst the multitudinous temptations. This is the other side of the shield—the much-presented face of which is so sadly tarnished.

May it not be that those in Hollywood who do retain the priceless faith of little children, and in intervals of rest "come home to Mother"—the Church—are the really happy ones of Hollywood?

#### RAINBOW'S END

It did not hang in a homely pot,  
The gold I glimpsed at the rainbow's end.  
From where I lay, in a lofty spot,  
I saw the delicate, tinted bend  
Drop one far point in the sea, and one  
On a hovel ringed by ragged trees.  
It was fringed with gauze snipped off the sun;  
It dripped pale honey from Heaven's bees;  
It glowed with polleny flecks of praise  
From rain-fed flowers, and it deigned to spill  
This gorged, gold tip in a fairy haze  
On one small hovel below a hill.

LORI PETRI.



## The German Center Party: 1871-1890

JOSEPH T. DURKIN, S.J.

"**A**M I the only one in all Germany unafraid to debate against this man?"—a strange exclamation to come from Bismarck, at the height of his power! He was referring to Windthorst, leader of the Center party. How had that body grown to be such a formidable opponent of the Government?

The Center had had its birth in the anti-Catholic campaign inaugurated by Bismarck soon after his entry into office. The Iron Chancellor had left no doubt as to his intention of crushing the Catholic Church in Germany. He would mould a united nation: and, in his eyes, a prerequisite was the demolition of Catholicism and the creation of a national Protestant church, subservient to the State. Such a policy enjoyed the additional advantage of sealing the union between the Government and the National-Liberals, who would cheerfully support anyone against Rome.

By the autumn of 1871 the offensive had been definitely launched. Bishop Krementz, of the Ermland district, complained to Berlin that his priests were being fined for preaching the inviolability of the rights of the Church. The Government replied that the penal measures were justified by the new law termed the "Kanzel Paragraph," which rendered liable to such punishment those employing language inimical to the State. When the Catholic schools in the Rhineland opened in the September of the following year, Government inspectors walked impressively down between the rows of frightened children. By the terms of the school bill of the preceding March, the State would henceforth control the teaching of the Catechism.

It was in reaction to such aggressions that early in January, 1871, a small group of Catholics had formed a political party which they named the Center. The party's platform, drafted largely by Mallinckrodt, the two Reichenspergers, Frankenstein, Savigny, and Windthorst, emphasized their stand on the grants of the Prussian Constitution of 1848. They were in sympathy with political liberalism, so far, and only so far, as it respected the rights of Catholics.

The Center [read the platform] is not a sectarian party. It is open to all without exception. The Center wishes liberty not only for the Catholic Church, but for all religious groups. . . . We take our stand on the terrain of religious toleration. We aim to reconquer religious liberty, civil liberty, liberty of every kind.

The pioneer Centrists were, by the very nature of their position, Catholics of a militant stamp, battling against heavy odds for the most fundamental rights of the Church: but this was not their only side. They were, not seldom, men of a deep-rooted spiritual life. Some of them have described how they would compose their speeches before their crucifix. And Mallinckrodt was not out of character when he whispered to his friends after one of his successful debates in the Landtag, "How you must have been praying for me!"

They were not always on the battle line. In the evenings they puffed their meerschaums and relaxed in their old gardens, amid their children and grandchildren. They built up warm friendships, and took the keenest delight in chatting with cronies over a moderate stein. There was a fair sprinkling of lawyers among them, a large proportion from the nobility, and considerable representation from the clergy. Mallinckrodt was their first president, succeeded in 1874 by Windthorst.

In its first parliamentary battles for Catholic rights the Center was not notably successful. It was helpless to prevent the passage of the bill which provided for Government supervision of all schools and ecclesiastical seminaries. The enactment placed the effective direction of these institutions in the hands of the State, to the grave detriment of the prerogatives of the Church. The most the Centrists could do was to break a gallant lance in defense of the usurped rights. "Religious instruction in the schools belongs to the Church," cried Reichensperger, "it is her right, by the natural and positive law." And there was no answer from the benches of the Left.

At this time the Center's important work lay in organizing, clarifying, and guiding Catholic popular opinion, developing a strong Catholic electorate, and maintaining Catholic morale. The embattled Ultramontanists in the Reichstag, even though losing on individual issues, were a concrete argument for the Catholic people that they should not give up the fight in defense of their religious liberty.

So far, the laws of oppression had been, in many respects, only preliminaries. With the project for suppressing the Jesuits, presented to the Landtag by Bismarck in May, 1872, there was a general acceleration of the Kulturkampf.

We are under no illusions as to the intentions of our opponents [Windthorst told the Reichstag], it is the annihilation of the Church founded by God Himself. . . . But, gentlemen, I warn you solemnly, you cannot destroy that Church: you will destroy yourselves—that will be the dénouement of this tragedy. It is impossible to attack the Catholic Church without wounding Christianity to the heart. . . . The project of a great national church is an absurd fantasy.

At the elections of 1871, sixty Catholic deputies had been sent to the Reichstag. The Iron Chancellor realized that he had a fight on his hands.

The Kulturkampf reached its climax in the series of measures known as the May Laws, passed in successive Mays of '73, '74, and '75. The first, published May 15, 1873, established for Germany what was practically a Civil Constitution of the Clergy. Legislation regarding the training of clerics, administration of the Sacraments, and ecclesiastical discipline in general, took from the Church her freedom of action in her Divinely given sphere. Completing this usurpation, Bismarck passed his second group of May Laws in the Spring of the next year. The Government's control over ecclesiastical appoint-

ments was extended, and its powers to discipline priests and Bishops made almost unlimited.

If the Center had any power, now was the time to show it. As a matter of fact, they were contesting bitterly every step, opposing the Chancellor to his face in the Reichstag, lining up the Catholic voting strength throughout the nation, and feeding the ever-growing Catholic press with ammunition against the Kulturkampf. In the autumn of 1874 the Government was closing seminaries all over the country and had punished 400 priests with fine or imprisonment: but at the elections of that year the Center won twenty-eight additional seats in the Reichstag. To save his own candidacy, even Bismarck was forced to make a hurried stumping campaign through his native and strongly Protestant Pomerania.

In the face of the unexpected opposition, the Chancellor pushed through the Reichstag, in April, 1875, the last of the May laws. In many respects it was the most shameful of them. The State was given the power to withhold at will the periodical financial allocations guaranteed to the clergy by the Constitution of 1848. The measure has been termed, not undeservedly, the "starvation law," for it deprived the priest of his only means of daily sustenance. To obey the stipulations of the law was to recognize the usurpations of the Church's rights by the State; to disobey it meant poverty. The clergy, with few exceptions, held firm against the bribe, and were cheered wildly in the streets by their adoring people.

The tide, however, was on the turn. Despite his oft-repeated assertion that he "would never go to Canossa," Bismarck, under pressure of the events of 1875-1882, began to seek means for a dignified retreat from his Kulturkampf positions. It was becoming increasingly evident to him that the Catholic people would not be bludgeoned into denying their Faith, and the clergy could not be bought. Furthermore, with the Socialist peril on the horizon, it was an inopportune time to alienate those who were the traditional supporters of established government. In this conviction he was strengthened by additional gains for the Center at the October elections of 1882.

He undertook a series of long-drawn-out negotiations with Rome, marred by not a little meanness on his part and a grudging manner of making the required concessions. A *modus vivendi* was arranged in the Spring of 1887. Recognition was accorded to all the essential rights of the Church, nearly all the Kulturkampf laws repealed, and the rights of Catholic education guaranteed. The Iron Chancellor had indeed gone to Canossa, although his adversaries very prudently called the town by another name. And no one doubted that it was the stubborn pounding by the guns of the Center that had finally forced his surrender.

But the Center's work was not exclusively defensive. It was performing also the function of a badly needed opposition party. Bismarck's Government, even apart from its anti-Catholic policy, was operating in two very dangerous directions. It was sponsoring a program of pronounced State absolutism, and it was continuing a

tradition of heavy military expenditure which was anything but conducive to European peace.

Against both these trends the Center fought consistently. In protesting against the incursions of the civil power into the ecclesiastical domain, the Centrists were at the same time insisting on the essential limitations of constitutional government—a much-needed lesson in the century of so-called liberalism. Mallinckrodt jarred the Reichstag one day with his blunt warning that "We are headed for Imperialism. . . . Not yet have we an *Imperator* on the throne, but it is evident that we have one on the bench of Ministers!"

And so fundamental to the Centrists' program was their opposition to militarism that they refused to yield on the point even at the request of Rome itself. As a means of forwarding the religious negotiations, Pope Leo had urged the Center to support Bismarck's bill for an increased army budget. But the men whose devotion to Rome was certainly beyond dispute declined to compromise on a policy which they declared was absolutely essential to their existence as a political party.

In another way the Center served a crying need. The mortal danger for all stable government in the middle of the century was Socialism. In the elections of 1877 the followers of Marx and Liebknecht had made alarming gains. From Dresden, Breslau, and other large cities came reports of police clashes with Socialists who became daily more aggressive. In Bavaria, workingmen were being excited by Bebel's agitators, shouting harangues from the porches of deserted rectories. The meaning of the situation was not lost on the Government.

Windthorst minced no words in telling the Reichstag that "the pernicious doctrine of Socialism can be combated only upon the terrain of Catholic principles. . . . With your schools from which religion is banished, a victory over Socialism is impossible."

But the Centrist leaders, in fighting the Socialist peril, did more than merely warn. They faced frankly the unpleasant facts of social conditions, and they proposed and put into practice constructive remedies. They saw that one of the chief reasons for Socialist successes was the material misery of the masses. "The half of the votes gained by the Socialists"—it was a Center deputy speaking—"is due to the wretched living conditions of the people. . . . We must banish those conditions."

It is an historical fact too little realized that in Germany during the last half of the nineteenth century, the only group consistently advocating social reform of a non-radical type was the Center. Reichensperger was denounced—by the Liberals!—as a revolutionist for upholding the right of the workingman to organize. The *Arbeiterwohl*, founded in 1880 under Centrist inspiration, formulated one of the very first codes of fair dealing between employers and laborers. Certainly Bismarck, until his last few years, was much opposed to the social ameliorations which we now regard as elementary.

In the practical application of social-reform projects the Center took the undisputed lead. While the Nationalists in the Reichstag were bewailing "the lawless com-



binations of the working classes against the established order," the Catholic Congress at Mannheim could open with a parade of 20,000 workingmen, representing 170 labor associations. Under the tutelage of the Center, the Catholics brought together, at the Cologne Congress of 1887, 340 distinct workingmen's groups. Throughout Germany there stretched a network of land banks, the

creations largely of Centrists, providing loans at low interest rates to farmers, and assuring financial security.

The party of the Center served a need, and is now gone. It championed, during a half-century and more, the most sacred rights of the Catholic Church, and kept before the eyes of Europe the Catholic idea of social justice and social charity.

## An Open Letter to M. Litvinov

WILFRID PARSONS, S.J.

DEAR M. Litvinov:

As you are approaching the shores of this country for the first time in your life, the eyes of our citizens are on you, and it has seemed that it might be profitable for you to hear at first hand what is in our minds at the expectation of this momentous event.

The news that our President had invited you to come to Washington to discuss with him personally the "serious but not insoluble" questions outstanding between our country and yours was "received with mixed feelings," as our press sometimes expresses it. But even those who, like this Review, have opposed recognition of your regime in Russia were willing to have you come and will welcome you. We understand thoroughly, as the President was at pains to make clear, that since this is a conference precisely to discuss those questions, no commitment has been made by him binding him to recognition beforehand, that his "mind is open," as he is so fond of saying, and that, having become thoroughly acquainted with the arguments for or against recognition on this side, he is desirous of hearing your own story directly, so that he may be in a position to decide. If it turns out that the questions he mentions can be and are solved, then we are ready to welcome diplomatic relations without further ado.

So you may be sure at the outset that the President has our confidence and support in these discussions. It is true that such powerful bodies as the American Legion and the American Federation of Labor have just recently gone on record as against recognition, as have many Catholics and Protestants, for both patriotic and religious reasons. Most of these are among those who supported him at the last elections. This does not mean that they will now turn against him; it does mean that they are behind him when he vigorously defends before you the American interests and the American thesis in the questions that are in dispute.

We are well aware that *de jure* recognition involves the admission that the Government recognized is the *de facto* Government, that it is stable, that it is able and willing to fulfil its international obligations, and that it is friendly to the country that recognizes it.

That your Government is the *de facto* Government in Russia and that it is stable we are fully willing, if somewhat ruefully, to admit, and indeed we have admitted it for some time past. I imagine that you will pass over that point at once, as soon as you have presented your credentials. That many of us do not like your form of

government, that we feel you do not allow freedom of the press, of religion, of association, as we do in most democratic countries, we concede are not legal obstacles to beginning diplomatic relations. We recognized Czarist Russia and Turkey in their worst days, and we recognize Mexico and Spain, both of which are anti-democratic and military despotisms. But you will admit that these honest prejudices among us do exist, and that the President must take them into account in his final decision and in his talks with you.

Also, as for your willingness and ability to fulfil international obligations, you will know where to find us, for you have observed from a detached position our dealings with our other European debtors for some years past. Such obligations in recent years have come to mean financial ones, in large part, and that is what the average newspaper writer means by them wholly. I imagine, however, that the President will not confine himself to those, for he will probably, for his own peace of mind, want to be sure that there will not be a repetition of the curious Vickers trial earlier this year. You will probably find, too, that you did not come out of that so handsomely in our minds, in spite of Mr. Duranty's best efforts. But that question, too, at best will interest only a part, if a powerful one, of our population.

You know, of course, that we in this country entertain strong feelings about the treatment of religion. This question, too, I admit, is not one that enters into the legal formalities of recognition; but it is a matter of policy that both you and the President will undoubtedly have in the foreground of your minds in all your talks. The cruel treatment by Hitler of those of your own race, and the protests, not only by Jews, but by Christians as well, are too recent for you to put out of your attention. There are many Christians and Jews in this country who are well informed on what has happened to their fellow-religionists in Russia, and in Siberia, and on Solovetsky Island. Indeed, at the back of their minds that, even more than your experiments in undemocracy, is what has held them back from loving you. We are well aware that the terms of their punishment were that they had disobeyed the laws; but we are likewise acquainted with the rebuttal that a law can also be a persecution, and most Americans do not hold that disobedience to a bad or persecuting law is a crime, particularly in the matter of conscience.

Frankly, then, the repugnance which many feel to beginning diplomatic relations with you will not be easy to

overcome. Rather, there will have to be overwhelming compensating advantages to counterbalance it, and to make it acceptable to the President's fellow-countrymen.

It has come to be the fashion in the newspapers to admit that these advantages will consist in the opening up of your vast dominions to our trade. I would not like to admit that our scruples can be so easily smothered, or by so base a motive, though your own vast experience with human nature may incline you to feel the opposite. Besides, the terms of this trade will be scrutinized with considerable pertinacity by the Americans. There is much more knowledge among us now concerning international exchange than before 1929, when we were crediting the Germans with billions, much of which they handed on to you, and it is quite well recognized that the drying up of this credit in Germany has made you more than anxious to get at its source in this country.

It is known that you are too clear headed to attempt it, so we will not even suspect that you will describe these credits to us as simply Russian purchases in America, as I am afraid you did to the London Conference. The facts of such trade have had a thorough airing. We understand that the goods you buy will not be paid for at first by you, but by the American banks with their depositors' money, or by the R. F. C. with the taxpayers'; that you will then owe our banks or the R. F. C. that amount of money, plus the inevitable premium according to our estimate of the risk involved; and that this obligation of yours to us will be a short-term one, payable in a year, or three years at most. We are curious to hear how you propose to pay this debt to us.

When you made a trade agreement with Great Britain, the matter was easy. You bought about \$25,000,000 worth from her, and you sold her about \$145,000,000 worth. That left you a cosy trade balance in London, which you converted into gold, and later withdrew, when she could least afford it, to pay your bills in other countries. But you will not be able to do that here, because you will never be able to sell us anywhere near as much as we sell you, if we sell you \$100,000,000 worth of goods a year, as is promised in the papers. Our high tariff will forbid that, and so you will have an unfavorable trade balance with us, which you will have to liquidate in gold, from your own country, or from another, if you should have any there. I understand from the *New York Times* that this security of payment, not your willingness but your ability to pay, is what is intriguing the President, and the vast majority of our people with him. You and he together will have to solve the dilemma either of your not buying so much from us as has been foretold, or, if you do, of finding some way of paying for it, outside of goods sold to us. I am afraid that you will realize before long that our citizens are lightly regarding this matter as one of our selling you millions' worth, and buying nothing in return.

The last condition for recognition, however, is also the most important. The President has first of all to be assured that we are beginning diplomatic relations with a friendly country. This may seem to be a strange thing to

bring up, and it is not ordinarily brought up, unless after a war. But with you the case is different. Your Government controls a vast international organization, with its headquarters in Moscow and its branches in every large city here, whose purpose for existing is the eventual overthrow of our own Government by violence, not by evolution as the Socialists intend and as you scorn them for intending. This organization, which is called the Third International, we know perfectly well to be an identical thing with your Government. For a time the pretense was maintained that the two were different, and that your Government was not responsible for the doings of a society which merely happened to exist in your capital city. You probably know already that the pretense has lost its force; even the *New York Times* admits that now. So you will not be able to use that argument or promise, least of all with the President.

If that is so, what will you do? The papers are saying that you will eagerly promise that Bolshevik propaganda will cease, and that then the only question will be whether we are impolite enough to disbelieve your solemn promise. But that is hardly the point. Surely, for you to prove that you are a friendly nation you will have to do more than that. We are not foolish enough to imagine that immediately after recognition our country would be flooded with Russians preaching the world revolution. Our immigration laws will take care of that. And with all due deference, I make bold to say that if they did come our people would not believe them, as the Chinese did. The point is the Third International, of which our Communist party here is a branch. As long as you keep this organization in existence, how are you going to prove to the President the important point that you are a friendly nation?

A disavowal by you of all Communist propaganda here will hardly suffice, as I said. We know enough from England's and Germany's example to be sure that as long as the Third International exists the propaganda, supported from Moscow, will go on just the same, though you personally may not like it and feel it embarrasses you, as has been said. The only way by which you can establish your Government's friendliness to the satisfaction of our people is not to disavow the propaganda, not to sever the Third International from your Government, but to put an end to the Third International itself. DISSOLVE IT. Is that too great a price to pay for recognition by this great nation? I think you will find that it will be regarded by the great majority within it as the only solid guarantee of the sincerity of your Government. Facts speak louder than words, as we say here.

P.S. Since writing the above, I have read Leon Trotsky's article in the *New Republic* on "Russia and World Revolution." Your exiled former colleague adroitly manages to repeat his old accusations against Stalin and at the same time to answer those who call for an end to the Third International. Stalin has already practically ended it, he says, so we need worry no longer about it. If that is so, then all you have to do is to come out openly, acknowledge the fact, and really end it. That, after all, is all that I am asking of you.



Education**Catholic Education Week**

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

**I**T was some ten years ago, I think, that I wrote a paper on the place of sociological studies in the elementary and the secondary school. Probably it was brief; had it treated of the place actually held by those studies, it could not have been long. As far as I can recall, there was no response of any kind, but that was to be expected. Leo XIII had written his great Encyclical thirty years earlier; but much dust can gather in less than three decades. I sometimes think that from 1900 to 1929 the favored resting place of all dust in the neighborhood of many Catholic libraries was that soul-searching, soul-stirring Encyclical.

True, we used it in the later 'nineties and in the early part of the century as an arsenal for guns to be trained on Socialists. The other pages of the Encyclical were glued together. The hardy spirit who soaked, or pried, or broke, them apart, and quoted pertinent paragraphs on wages, collective bargaining, labor unions, or the peril to the country when the country's wealth sluiced into a few pools only, ran the risk of being dubbed a Socialist. The protection of the wary was to label every paragraph, with meticulous care, "Taken from an Encyclical by Leo XIII." I used that little device myself for a number of years. Whenever I overlooked it, there would be trouble; sometimes serious trouble.

Now that the social ideals of the Church are discussed in Congress and in every forum in the land, we can look back to those dark days with wonder tempered by amusement. We can even hope that no boy or girl will hereafter leave our grammar schools without the knowledge that the Seventh and Eighth Commandments bind in business and professional as well as in private life, and that there is no human activity whatever from which the laws of justice and charity can be excluded; in other words, without the knowledge that the Gospel of Jesus Christ, applied to human life, is the social philosophy of the Catholic Church.

One indication, among many, which gives solid ground for this hope is the program arranged by the Department of Education of the National Catholic Welfare Conference for Catholic Education Week. Based entirely on "A Statement in the Present Crisis," by the Bishops who compose the Conference's Administrative Committee, the program is in reality a brief syllabus of social study. As it is to be hoped that our schools and parishes will make use of it, I quote it here. Ample matter for reference will be found in the bibliography.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1933

## THE DEPRESSION AND ITS CAUSES

1. The Great War and its aftermath.
2. Mass production and speculation.
3. Materialism and greed.
4. Ignoring the rights of man.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1933

## THE CRISIS IN EDUCATION

1. Education without religion, a cause of materialism.
2. The Catholic philosophy of education.
3. The true function of the school in relation to the home.
4. The parent as educator.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1933

## UNEMPLOYMENT

1. Our natural resources.
2. Our spirit of self-reliance and independence.
3. Wealth in the hands of the few.
4. Higher wages and unemployment insurance.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 1933

## RESTORE CHRISTIANITY AND AUTHORITY

1. Restore the authority of Christ.
2. Restore parental authority.
3. Restore the proper function of the State.
4. Restore international confidence.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 1933

## ADULT EDUCATION

1. The advantages of group study.
2. Leading subjects requiring study.
3. Influencing public opinion.
4. Defense of the rights of religion.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 11, 1933

## THE N. R. A. AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

1. The N. R. A., an experiment in social justice.
2. Cooperation and the employer.
3. Cooperation and labor.
4. Cooperation and the consumer.
5. Success of the N. R. A. dependent upon religious and spiritual sanctions.

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1933

## CATHOLIC ACTION

1. The call of the present crisis.
2. The need of Catholic higher education.
3. The press as a means of Catholic Action.
4. The spirit of the Gospel and the cure of social ills.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Articles in *AMERICA*: "The Pope and Corporations," G. B. Donnelly, S.J., March 11 and 25, April 15, 1933; "Recovery and a Human Week," I. A. J. Lawres, August 19, 1933; "The Battle for the Poor," E. P. Murphy, S.J., September 30, 1933; "Religion and the Union," September 30, 1933; "A Minimum Wage Scale," G. S. de Lorimier, September 30, 1933.

Articles in the *Commonweal*: "Social Justice—A Program," R. D. Skinner, July 28, 1933; "Beyond the N. R. A.," Edgar Schmiedeler, O.S.B., September 22, 1933; "Economics and Ethics," J. A. Ryan, October 6, 1933; "The N. R. A. and the Constitution," J. A. Ryan, October 20, 1933.

Articles in *Catholic Action*: "N. C. W. C. Bishops on the Present Crisis," P. J. Ward, July, 1933; "The National Industrial Recovery Act," R. A. McGowan,

July, 1933; "Greed in Industry," J. A. Ryan, August, 1933; "Constructive Work of the 73rd Congress," W. F. Montavon, August, 1933; "Civic and Political Morality," J. A. Ryan, September, 1933; "Testing the N. R. A. by Catholic Social Teaching," R. A. McGowan, October, 1933; "Catholic Action and the National Recovery Administration," October, 1933.

Articles in *Thought*: "Economic Depression and the School Child," M. J. McCormick, December, 1932; "The Machine Age: Era of Trade and Technical Skill," C. J. Freund, June, 1933.

Articles in the *Catholic Educational Review*: "Education and Journalism," G. N. Shuster, February, 1933; "Effect of the Depression on Child Health," H. Smith, October, 1933.

National Catholic Educational Association Material: Sermon of Most Rev. J. T. McNicholas at 1932 Convention, and "The World Crisis and Its Challenge to Catholic Education," by Rev. George Johnson, *Bulletin*, August, 1932; "Sursum Corda (On the Crisis in Education)," Most Rev. J. B. Peterson, *Bulletin*, August, 1933.

It may be objected that these topics are above the capacity of the pupil in the elementary school. I answer that no insuperable difficulty will be perceived by the teacher who understands the topics himself, and has the gift, necessary in his profession, of imparting what he knows. The Church asks that children be instructed in religion from the earliest years in the home, and thereafter in schools of all grades, *pro captu suo*, "according to the pupil's capacity." In the Catholic home, the babe of two years begins that recondite treatise which the theologian labels *De Deo Uno et Trino*, and the sublime truth of the existence of One God in Three Divine Persons is apprehended by babe and theologian alike, not in equal extension and profundity, but each according to his capacity. Each knows what he knows, and what each knows is true. If our schools do not draw back from the work of taking the child over the whole extent of the Christian Revelation, they should not think impossibly difficult the task of interpreting to him, *pro captu suo*, the Encyclicals of Leo XIII and of Pius XI on questions that must be settled, and settled right, if this civilization is to endure.

We are accustomed to say, rightly, in my judgment, that if the average child is not grounded in his religion in the Catholic school, morally speaking he will never be grounded in it. I think the same dictum can be applied to the Church's social philosophy.

It would follow, then, that the work must be begun in the elementary school. Comparatively few children go through high school, although, thank God, the number is increasing yearly, and still fewer enter college, while the number of graduates, compared with the total elementary-school population, is negligible. Much can be done in lyceums, night schools, extension courses, lectures, and other means of instruction, and these must be encouraged; but if we are to train a social-minded generation, it would seem to be imperative that every boy and girl

finishing the eighth grade should know at least the fundamentals of the Church's social philosophy. Fine distinctions and erudite discussions are unnecessary. We do not ask the little girl with her blue-backed catechism, and the theologian making a public defense of the whole field of theology and philosophy, to answer and explain in the same terms.

I hope that one result of this Catholic Education Week will be the focussing of attention by our school authorities on the elementary and secondary pupil's need of instruction in social science. It will be their chief task to arrange a suitable program; I suspect that most of them realize the need.

### Sociology

## Beet Sugar and Oppression

ARTHUR E. GLEASON, S.J.

THE American palate demands 5,500,000 tons of sugar per year. It gets this enormous supply from cane and beets, but the cane-sugar producers grab the lion's share. Beet sugar is only a fourth of the total annual output, the 1932-33 crop being about 1,160,000 tons of refined sugar. But the fact that only 14,000 hands are employed in the cane-sugar business whereas 200,000 toilers are hard at it in the beet fields, makes more interesting the study of profits reaped by beet-sugar capitalists.

In watching the beet-sugar game, one striking fact is noted. There is in the business a certain something as important as the shapely, long white beet itself. This particular something contributes nothing whatever to the actual production of the beet, or the refining of the sugar, and yet without it there would be no American beet-sugar industry. This thoroughly unnecessary, all important something is the sugar tariff. So our attention is fixed on this artificial governmental barrier. When we consider the purpose of a tariff, and observe that a particular tariff is responsible for profits that run into millions annually, and when we become acquainted with a few hideous facts concerning the labor employed to create these swollen profits, a just indignation consumes us. Simple justice demands that no tariff be put on imports unless it really helps the country at large, and certainly no tariff should be inflicted on the people merely to enrich a few business barons. The end and aim of government is to secure the general good of the nation, and not to subserve some favored clique.

Unfortunately, justice and greed are at war, and too often greed wins the battle. Thus it happened that clever lobbyists in 1897 first put over a stiff tariff on imported raw sugar, and in 1930 the duty of 2.2 cents a pound went up to 2.5 cents per pound. On the occasion of boosting this tariff, Senator Smoot of Utah said that, "No one need feel concerned with respect to the increased duties on sugar. . . . They are a national blessing." A national blessing! In sober truth this blessing was pronounced not for the nation, but for beet-sugar producers. As a matter of history, Nelson Dingley, father of the sugar tariff,



openly stated in the House of Representatives that "the general increase in duty on sugar is to further encourage the production of beet sugar." Due to the fact that the price of cane controls the price of beet sugar, it happens that all of us who buy a bag of toothsome crystals must pay two and a half cents more on every pound in order to sweeten the profit pot in the beet-sugar game.

Another point concerning tariffs and beet sugar is worthy of consideration. The purpose of all American tariffs is supposedly to protect the American worker lest he suffer from unmatchable cheap foreign labor. Has the tariff wall on sugar, first erected in McKinley's administration and built higher during Hoover's regime, attained this end? Does it, or does it not, protect the native worker against the foreign laborer? Most assuredly it does not. Instead of protecting standard American living conditions and safeguarding a good wage level, this tariff protects the giant, Beet Sugar, Inc., who, in thanks for this governmental assistance, forces wages so low that even in deep-depression unemployment he must get non-American hirelings to slave for him. In Michigan, the beet fields are tended by Slavs, collected in the slums of Cleveland and Detroit; in Utah and Idaho, Indians are borrowed from the reservations; in California, Japanese are hired for the back-breaking work; in Colorado, Mexicans form the staple labor supply. And this is how the Dingley Tariff protects the American laborer.

Last August one of these protected laborers, Leo Rodriguez, learning that a sugar-stabilization hearing was in progress at Washington, trekked to the national capitol to represent the beet workers. For hours Rodriguez listened to the high-salaried sugar executives and glib-tongued representatives haggle for every possible advantage, and heard the beet-sugar men refuse absolutely any restrictive quota. Late in the day, the selfish demands of the money interests gave way to his exposé of the workers' lot. Rodriguez told the investigators how he and his family of six toiled from sun-up to sunset thinning a nine-acre beet patch. For this hard labor Rodriguez and family received the generous sum of four cents an hour. Nor is this appalling wage an exaggeration or an exception. Statistics given out by the Bureau of Labor in the prosperous year 1927, verify the man's statement of the slave wage paid beet workers. The Labor Bureau found that Mexicans were imported (to help the tariff protect American labor?), were placed on beet farms by the refining companies, and were given for six months' work, on an average, \$145.34, the equivalent of \$1.13 a day. The fact that these figures were found true in prosperous times, and that the investigation covered nearly 15,000 Mexican beet-field laborers makes it hardly less than dishonest drivel to reply that, "in these hard times there are exceptional cases of underpaid workers."

When Señor Rodriguez completed his testimony of the "awful living conditions among the beet workers in Colorado," H. A. Hammond, representing a beet growers' association in that State, arose, and gave what he considered a rebuttal. But instead of advancing any evidence to show that the pay of the beet workers was reasonable,

or at least, all that the companies could afford, he gave this worthless information: "There are plenty of beet workers in the Arkansas Valley who have comfortable homes and drive just as good a car as I do." But how long and how hard a worker would have to toil in the beet fields at \$1.13 a day to buy—not drive—a good car, Mr. Hammond conveniently overlooked. However, he declared that while exceptional cases existed especially in these hard times, workers of his district (southern Colorado) had approved the terms of labor contracts and held them to be fair. What he means is this: semi-monopolistic growers and refiners, shielded from legal interference, and having but one refinery in a given neighborhood, are strong enough to pit one unskilled, destitute man against his destitute fellows, and to wring from him labor for the scantiest pittance which he can be induced to accept. To get out of men the utmost exertion of which they are capable, for the smallest wage possible, is what the beet-sugar capitalists call a "fair contract." Educated men, business leaders, pretend not to see that such a policy is morally wrong, that such a contract is not fair.

While it is most certainly true that without the protecting tariff the beet-sugar industry could not compete with its sugar-cane rival, and therefore could not even exist in genuine laissez-faire economics, nevertheless the industrial exploitation of the beet worker is carried on under the specious plea of "freedom of contract." Some men, clever in the art of making money, are too dull to see that for real freedom of contract there must be some parity of condition. But what bargaining parity is there between unskilled, unorganized, half-starved laborers, and the greedy, opulent giants who dominate an industry? No one acquainted with human greed and modern business ethics, will be rash enough to expect a "fair contract" to result from bargaining between such unequal forces.

Perhaps someone will endeavor to defend the men ultimately responsible for the insultingly low wages paid beet workers, on the score that the companies cannot afford to pay more. The theory is that a going corporation must above all else look to its own profits. According to this theory, juicy profits for stockholders and fabulous salaries for executives are far more important items than fair wages for the hired hands who produce the profits. This un-Christian policy explains the secret of how great wealth can be squeezed from sugar beets. In 1924 the Great Western Sugar Co., producer of about half of the American beet sugar, could show a net income of \$12,003,304, an income wrung from sugar beets and \$1.13 a day labor. Carlyle once called Socialism "Pig Philosophy." One wonders if the contrary system whereby a small number of stockholders is enriched \$50,000,000 in ten years, while 100,000 workers are paid a starvation wage, does not merit the title "Hog Philosophy."

When admonished of the abominable wages they force upon the beet workers, the gentlemen responsible give us the rhetoric of Senator Smoot of Utah: "Without sugar beets . . . the sites of hundreds of thousands of happy contented homes would see little but the prowling coyote and the skulking timber wolf." But to name the number

of dollars paid the western farmer for his sugar-beet crop, to rant about the benefits deriving from this industry, is all beside the mark. The objection raised is one of inhuman wages. The real point is this: the stupendous profits reaped by the sugar-beet growers and refiners prove beyond cavil that they can well afford to pay the farmer more for his beets, and permit him to pay his "hands" something near a living wage.

But unhappy experience has shown that the toiler will never get his living wage without legislative help. And no time is more acceptable than the present. Now is the hour for justice to win over greed. The N. R. A. has for its end the recovery of a reasonable prosperity, and the means to this end are the betterment of the laborer's lot, and its corollary, the increase and distribution of purchasing power. The nation therefore must fly with the Blue Eagle into the face of the oppressor, and demand that this American bird spread its protective wings over the 200,000 serfs in the beet fields, even as McKinley's and Hoover's Congress spread a protective tariff over the interests of beet-sugar capitalists.

### *With Scrip and Staff*

THE time has come, thinks the Pilgrim, to leave the word again to the Anchorite.—It is not to Serendip that the Anchorite has now ventured. He has arrived at Utopia. For the benefit of the infrequent readers, and the ill-remembering, it may be recalled, though the matter is not important, that this person who is disguised as Anchorite spoke about the land of Serendip, where serendipity flourishes on the last occasion when he had the privilege of this scrippity, scrappity column. That mystifying country began at an ice-house habitation in July. Its other terminus was a straight line drawn through August at a dark and unmentionable hour in and about Riverside Drive. Which is all truly serendipitous, for the things one doesn't expect to happen are the normal things that are always expected in Serendip. There shall be no "for example" in illustration, except those few innocuous applications heretofore adduced. The instances might well serve for the pages of a mystery magazine. They might find a place among the amazing things that the Pilgrim records, such, for example, as when he stumbled into the pious convent of the Harmonians. Or Father Hubbard, the glacier-priest except when he builds his igloo (there are none, he contends) in a little room above the editors of AMERICA, might furnish examples of serendipity, and be disbelieved, and protest that he can prove his yarn by photographs. These "for examples" from Serendip are far too many, are, shall I say as a professor? far too rouge-provoking to enumerate. For example, on that dark night when the Anchorite returned, no one would expect that. . . . No; no examples. Enough of Serendip. On to Utopia, where all things expected happen to the one expecting them. And if you are not looking too eagerly for Utopia, you may be the first to find it.

UTOPIA begins usually where the pavement ends, at almost any time of the year, and in almost every century. Sir Thomas More, I have heard learned professors confide, discovered and popularized the country. This bit of erudition is confirmed by Daniel Sargent in his new book on the shrewd Sir Thomas. I had always thought that Sir Thomas himself wrote of the country of Utopia from afar off, and had never been there. But from deep meditation on the subject in a modern Utopialet, I have concluded that he really did live in a Utopia whenever he managed to escape from the upsetting Serendip that England had become in his time. The English Serendip was most disturbingly serendipitous under plump Harry the King. It became even more so when Sir Thomas had his body cut off. There was a difference of opinion between him and the mountainous King. Whereas Sir Thomas believed that the head was more important than the body, the King was firmly convinced that the body and the flesh were of far greater value. Wherefore, the King had Sir Thomas' cut into two pieces and thus released the soul. When Sir Thomas used his head in his fidelity to the religion that King Harry-Marry found inconvenient, he lost his body. That was in Serendip. Whereupon, Sir Thomas' head, finding itself gloriously free, triumphantly rolled into the true and final Utopia. Today, when you see Sir Thomas you find a halo of sanctity circling his head. And when you see King Harry, you laugh at the funny, flat hat that covers his bulging eyes and triple chin. This shrewd, witty Thomas did know a great deal about Utopia.

HERE in our United States, politics are ruining many a fair prospect for Utopia, though the politicians promise a glorious and a prosperous future. They promise all that a person can hope for in any ideal state. They promise what contradictory hopes all contrary persons may have. But where politics, there dishonesty, there deceit, there graft, there partisanship, there throat-cutting, there all evils. Utopia is a desert or an island where only a single individual lives. Near to Utopia is the nearly deserted place where but a few live in peace, induced by religion and protected by no politics. That is where the Anchorite meditated on the disastrous world that the politicians have created in Europe, in the United States, in New York and in the universal Serendip. In his Utopialet he rediscovered that God alone must reign over Utopia, that religion must be the governing principle. But then, he thought of politics in religion, and recalled examples, and of religion in politics, and also recalled examples. It is all so irritatingly serendipitous.

ZOUNDS! the Pilgrim asks, what have the politicians done to the Anchorite, that he casts upon them such a joyless eye? Did he nourish the secret ambition to be Postmaster of Utopia; did these horrid folk forget him? Hardly can I think that. Rather, such a turn of affairs would stimulate his philosophy. Rather, it is nostalgia that moves him, which comes to all good men in the autumn.

THE PILGRIM.



Literature**The Materials of Fiction**

FRANCIS X. CONNOLLY

SOME TIME ago, in discussing the Catholic as novelist, I ventured to say that one of his peculiar difficulties was the restriction of certain materials which constitutes a great part of the modern novel. For if we presume that a writer is Catholic in culture as well as in religion, then we cannot escape the fact that there are many currently notorious subjects with which he can have little sympathy. The liberated personality represented by Ann Vickers, the axe-grinding characterizations of the Marxist group, the sensuous mysticism of the neo-romantics are the broad highways to a *succès d'estime* which his own intelligence compels him to shun.

Now upon first glance, the assertion that a writer should have difficulty with his material sounds faintly ridiculous. Professional authors testify to the deluge of plots and episodes which fairly inundate their beginnings, and English professors can tabulate several thousand possible stories. But the difficulty becomes less contemptible when we consider the obligations of the writer who attempts a serious human history rather than an amusing romance, a significant and poetic judgment rather than an ingenious *tour de force*. In this case, the author is concerned not only with the question, how I am to achieve my effect, but with the quality of the effect itself and even with its accidental repercussions. In other words, a man who is a Catholic and an artist engaged upon a work of fiction is bound not only by the rules of his art but also by the instincts of his culture.

Catholic critics, as far as I know, with a single exception, have not appreciated the weight of this double burden. During the past few years there has been a rather desperate cry for the young Catholic American novelist, but there have been very few discriminating commentaries on the possibilities of the Catholic novel. Many people have rather naively assumed that since we have cultured writers, a certain amount of leisure, and willing publishers, we should expect novels. Unfortunately novels are not written simply because conditions seem to favor their production. For apart from other difficulties which are in themselves sufficiently perplexing, one of the grittiest problems facing the young (or old) Catholic writer is the selection of a story in which he can at the same time justify his culture and his art. It is not a question of mixing art and piety, ingenuity and apologetics, or of writing a tale about Father O'Reilly's altar boys; it is rather a matter of finding what kind of story best yields itself to the demands of art and the genius of Catholicism.

This does not mean that I am offering a formula for fiction. One can hardly prescribe a plot or a situation and prudently expect a masterpiece. The point I wish to make is that in an age barren of an inspiring tradition, with a blank literaryscape which must be colored by some ideal pigment, without the convenience of example or the

tyranny of precedent, it is at least possible to help the prospective novelist by dragging his problem before competent literary doctors. I am adventurous enough to believe that a brief exploration of the sources of the novel, together with a glance at the attitude of the author will help them to determine our peculiar position with reference to fiction.

The average Catholic writer into whose culture has been integrated a sufficiently broad human experience usually finds that he is disposed to plan his fiction in three distinct ways. Conscious of the supernatural dignity of man, he tends to idealize actual or imaginary characters; possessing at least implicitly a universal philosophy, he is inclined towards an objective social criticism or personal satire; conscious of the tremendous implications of conscience and choice, he seeks to dramatize individual moral conflict. In the concrete he may combine all three ideas, without attempting formally to emphasize any one of them. But whether he is by preference or education a romanticist or a realist, presuming a serious Catholicism and a serious art, it is improbable that he would be attracted by the purely professional materials such as the quaint, the startling, or the picturesque. If he is different at all, it is because he sees life *sub specie aeternitatis*.

The precise advantage of these materials has not been evaluated, largely because we have not as yet made enough mistakes. We have had a certain sad but corrective experience in the way of idealized characters, but the sugary stories of pious Jane have been written by persons of very limited human knowledge, or by learned authors with an oratorical rather than a narrative technique. So, too, the novel of criticism resembles the efforts of ambitious teachers who journalize their lectures on a summer vacation. There is a musty odor of the textbook about them. The little portable typewriter clicked out mechanical stories to prove an article of faith, and only the genius of Hémon or Bourget could redeem their watery characterization and bloodless action. A novel moralizes us only when it pleases.

The true instinct of the artist is inclined to search out expressible moral conflict. Only dramatic action can artistically draw character or prove the emotional fact. And when the artist perceives the awful significance of deliberate choice, the possibly infinite implications of moral actions, he is intellectually hypnotized. Attentive to the eternal roar of conscience, he is the less excited by the buzz of reality or the pop of romance.

It is therefore very natural that the Catholic writer should seek his materials in human actions which are for him both religious and dramatic, familiar and terrorizing. Here, I fancy, lies the tangle. When the author conceives a strong story of an individual conscience, implying powerful temptation, responsible decision and the subsequent emotions, he is inclined according to his capacities either to the poeticized fable or the earthy fiction. In other words, his drama can be misty and allegorical, or it can in the ordinary symbols imitate life. Now the first effect lies within the province of poetry and the second, like

many things ostensibly simple, is thick with poisonous possibilities.

The drama of conscience concerns sin, real or imaginary. Literary history is filled with the internal moral snarls of Hamlets and Faustus, of men who deliberated, acted, and suffered the consequences of murder, theft, betrayal, avarice. It would be altogether false, however, not to admit that the human personality is most frequently torn in the conflict that rages between licit and illicit human love, between brute passion and the white sense of duty. And just as passion is the most frequent human temptation, so the record of its struggle in the soul is the most readily accessible material of the writer.

Now I am only too aware that the transcription of this struggle, unless accomplished with an almost breathless delicacy of imagination, is liable to offend. The personal differences of the writer determine whether it shall be for the most part crudely honest or irritatingly squeamish. Even when it approaches the middle path, the very nature of the subject annoys the mildly scrupulous. Physical incidents are bound to become violently alive in the glow of narration, and unless language is flattened into meaningless generalizations, some passages will publicly and privately be accounted scarlet. If a man is to write concretely and vividly, as he must in the novel, then we must be prepared to ask ourselves whether certain subjects can be treated by the Catholic novelist.

When sin is an integral part of a story, and when the writer cannot tone it down to absolute gentility without botching it, can he as a Catholic use this material? Some commentators have insisted that he can, provided that his attitude is fundamentally reverent. While we applaud the hardy liberalism of this opinion, it is nevertheless true that the undoubted reverence of René Bazin and Madame Undset has not been charitably interpreted by many of their readers. Apart from this, the question takes on a different aspect when we remember that we are considering it from the point of view of the harassed writer who has been paralyzed by his own conscience. He cannot be satisfied with indirection if he is using a form which is beyond all others particular and explicit, and the same prudence which prompts the critic and the lay reader to avoid the morbid and scandalous makes him tremulous in his execution. But if it is necessary, he is willing to abandon the field, with a natural reluctance but with relief, to the men of great genius in whom all contradictions are mysteriously resolved. Assuredly he cannot accommodate the contradiction between fear of scandal and his artistic instinct.

It is the immediate business of enlightened criticism to attack this problem. The critics have heretofore been exclusively casuistic, ready to find microscopic virtues and vices and indifferent to the general problem. We have travelled in circles prosecuting and defending "Kristin Lavransdatter," judging this passage immoral and that chapter blameless, but we have made no attempt to cure the embarrassed stutter of our writers. What is our standard? Do we permit certain topics? If we do, then we cannot complain if a novelist like Henry Longan

Stuart in "The Weeping Cross" describes plainly a scene of passion. If we do not, then let us attempt to persuade our young men to cease butting a stone wall. For if the philosopher cannot chart the busiest route of fiction, how can we expect the artist to navigate smoothly? We have left the writer to his own devices, cautiously turning over pages and categorizing it as good or bad, our eyes searching for a possible evil effect upon an innocent reader. What we have failed to consider is the torture of the author during his composition, as he subconsciously calculated what his book would do when it acquired its own objective existence in cold print. If the critic is interested in helping the author as well as in protecting the reader, in fostering a sturdy growth of healthy fiction instead of false candor or Grundyism, he must be prepared courageously to answer yes or no.

#### REVIEWS

**Political Parties in the Irish Free State.** By WARREN MOSS, PH.D. New York: Columbia University Press. \$3.00.

Dr. Moss limits his study of the Irish Free State Constitution to the political parties of Ireland, and special attention is centered upon organization as the important factor in determining election results. By a critical study of the party system and the background of the Irish elections, the author undertakes to show the nature of the Irish organization, both local and national, and to outline for the student of political science the necessity of understanding Irish history if a thorough understanding of Irish policies is to be grasped. As is always the case in party politics, conflicting and cooperating social and cultural groups are depicted seeking their own interests under a political leader who possibly will secure legislation to further these interests through the party. At present political life in the Irish Free State is more intense than any other form of society, and it naturally follows that the party spirit is proportionally intense. For this reason the book is topical. Because of the enormous details describing candidates and campaigns and delving into the intricate laws that govern the general elections, the student of political science will find here a source of political information scientifically explained. Three illuminating diagrams of party organization of Cuman Na nGaedheal, Fianna Fail, and the Irish Labor party, afford a comprehensive picture study of these political parties.

C. A. O'N.

**From Faith to Faith.** By W. E. ORCHARD, D.D. New York: Harper and Brothers. \$2.00.

To potential readers of Dr. Orchard's book in the edition published on this side of the Atlantic, the author's name may awaken vague memories of a London minister who seemed to lean to the sensational, whose church bore the strange name of King's Weigh House, who wrote in an American monthly the "Why I Am Not a Catholic" type of article. Dr. Orchard has not written with precisely this public in mind; his book is addressed to those whom he has left behind, in an endeavor to explain his change of faith, to convince others, to promote a better understanding of the issue between Protestantism and Catholicism and, finally, to take "the opportunity of placing on record how graciously God has dealt with me through all my life." Fully two-thirds of the book are taken up with the account of his eventful life, from his evangelical "conversion," through ten years of preaching in a Presbyterian pulpit at Enfield, and seventeen years in his Congregational chapel in London, to his resignation and subsequent visit to Rome, the last stage of a long journey. It was the gradual introduction of "Romanist" ritual and doctrine into the Non-conformist King's Weigh House that won Dr. Orchard publicity of dubious value from the sensational accounts in the newspapers. His eventual resignation from this pulpit, that he might be fair to himself and



his congregation in the decision that he was to make, brought forth many premature prophecies of his conversion, of which we on this side heard faint echoes. In the face of such unwelcome publicity and the duty that he felt he owed his former charges, Dr. Orchard was able to give long and serious thought to the making of his final decision to become a Roman Catholic. Of his success in telling well an interesting, sometimes amusing, story, as well as in disarming criticism of his sincerity and good sense, there can be no question. The remaining third of the book is devoted to a more explicit apologetic in three chapters addressed to Evangelicals, to other Christians, and to non-believers. There is none of the dry atmosphere of the theology manual in these chapters. Dr. Orchard's greatest strength, naturally enough, is manifest on the familiar ground of Evangelicalism; his weakness, perhaps, in the realms of science and metaphysics. Protestant and Catholic alike will find much food for thought suggested in these pages; the one, an answer to many of his difficulties; the other, a confirmation of his faith together with a salutary lesson, not only of sympathy for those who have not yet found the source of light; but of humility, in the realization that it is our own failure to reflect the light and truth of Catholic teaching in our lives that keeps many out of the Church.

W. C. T.

**The Shape of Things to Come.** By H. G. WELLS. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$2.50.

H. G. Wells' latest book is a history of the future, based upon an analysis of the trends of modern civilization. In criticizing the defects of the world today, Mr. Wells' pen is keen and sometimes brilliant. His review of the horrors and uselessness of the World War is especially good. But the past and the present world systems are to Mr. Wells as trees rotted to the heart, even now swaying dangerously in the breeze of world rebellion. They will crash, Mr. Wells prophesies, and from their dust will rise the Modern State, in which "we may now go naked, love as we like . . . jealousy we have, but it is rarely malicious, desire, but it is rarely vicious." Not a pillar of modern civilization will be left standing. Not a single stone of our present economic, political, educational, or religious systems can be saved. Obviously such a cataclysm leaves the reviewer in a rather hopeless frame of mind. The thing is too grotesque for serious criticism. It is just another brain storm of this popular writer who satisfies his egoism and intellectual vanity by remaking history, revamping mores, upturning society, and now playing prophet of a new creation more weird than that of Dodgson in his Wonderland.

H. R. A.

**The Use and Control of Alcoholic Drink.** By REV. EDWARD F. ANGLUIN, O.S.B., A.B., J.C.B., S.T.D. Washington: The Catholic University of America.

Father Angluin has produced both a scholarly summary of the moral theology of alcoholic drink and an interesting review of various methods of liquor control, both individual and social. The teaching of reason and Revelation; the liceity of moderate use; the sinfulness of excess; questions of grave and venial guilt; and many special cases and practical problems are skilfully treated. Father Angluin carefully distinguishes certain and probable doctrines, and takes a definite stand on disputed questions, while doing justice to opposing opinions. The one exception to this is his principle . . . "no civil law is to be presumed purely penal. It is to be held binding in conscience unless the indications for a purely penal law are clear" (p. 112). Here the author seems to desert his probabilism and totally ignores the opinion of Suarez on this important point (*De Legibus* 1.5, c.4, n.9). Granting that the presumption favors the legislator when the justice of a law, and consequently the existence of some obligation, is questioned, nevertheless when the nature of that obligation is doubtful, that is, whether it be direct or disjunctive, strictly moral or purely penal, sound probabilism favors liberty or the lesser obligation. *Odiosa sunt restringenda*. This, however, is the only questionable doctrine in a very timely and creditable treatise.

W. C.

## BOOKS AND AUTHORS

**Medical Evolution.**—The progress of modern medicine and surgery, through all the ages and countries, is a fascinating story. Stripped of its technical details it is told for the instruction of the curious layman by Dr. Logan Clendening in "Behind the Doctor" (Knopf. \$3.75). Here is shown how, after mankind had stumbled along the rough pathways of ancient and crude empiricism, we began to learn from a dairymaid, from a sailor, from an old market woman, a postmaster, a singing teacher; how, uniting all the past with the established facts of the sciences, and the practical methods of inventive genius, twentieth-century ministrations to the afflicted have taken on innovations and improvements that assure wonderful results for the general health and well-being of the community, and the amelioration of the conditions of those afflicted in the unfortunate incidents of everyday life. The stories of the experiments and discoveries of Jenner, Hunter, Virchow, Pasteur, Koch, Lister, Morton, O'Dwyer, Röntgen, Curie, and many other vivid personalities of the scientific world, depict in a very attractive fashion what resources the modern physician has at his command when he undertakes to treat your individual malady. The author is the contributor of the popular daily health article that is published in more than 250 newspapers throughout the country. It is usually safe and wise, hence it seems a pity that he has cluttered up his book with some of the time-worn fables about dissection and the early anatomists.

**Biography.**—Eric Linklater, an interesting author, a native of the Orkneys with a Norse name, writes an interesting brief account of "Mary Queen of Scots" (Appleton-Century. \$1.50). It is a popular, if not journalistic, sketch, free from anti-Catholic bias but adding nothing new. The ordinary authorities have been used without evidence of any original research. Mary is defended, although the defense of her relationship with Bothwell is weak, too much is made of her stay in France (did she really live much at court?), her virtue is made to rest too much on a nature sexually cold (was it?). Mary was an able woman, but very much a woman. Logic can never explain emotion. But for all that this is a wholesome entertaining story that will prompt the reader to go further and deeper.

**A Well-known Wanderer.**—A new travelogue by John Gibbons is most welcome. "Old Italy and New Mussoliniland" (Dutton. \$2.00) is a book that makes you a companion of the author on his brief holiday in modern, old Italy. The route leads you to many surprises, as it is not a professional Cook's tour, but is mapped out by the author's personal taste. So Rome is followed by a hamlet of the Abruzzi; Assisi and Loreto will lead on to that tiny republic of republicans, San Marino. And like the good householder the author brings out the old and the new from his treasure. You walk among the living dead as you visit medieval churches and view old-age castles; while the splendidly uniformed soldiers and the young members of the Balilla and the many posters with their Fascist insignia wake you to the land of the Duce. Among the observations of the book, the author has noted the splendid work in infant welfare done by the Government. The pleasure gained from reading this book is much the pleasure one would get from the letters of a friend who is at once a traveler and a sympathetic observer. Altogether the book will afford a pleasant little reading holiday.

**Sanity Comes to the Playwright.**—Since Eugene O'Neill wrote "Ah, Wilderness!" (Random House. \$2.50), and since the Theater Guild is producing it with George M. Cohan taking the part of the understanding father, "Ah, Wilderness!" is greeted by loud applause and praise. It is not such a poor play. Mr. O'Neill forgets for the time being that the race of man is not wholly sunk in deepest sin and insanity. He comes up out of his depths of despair and tragedy and smiles wanly. He actually writes what he calls a "comedy of recollection." It could be a

much better play, of course, but as it is, it is not too weak. It is the sort of play that any dramatist of experience and maturity might concoct and put into dialogue form, the sort that might have a Broadway run, and might conceivably be issued along with the other hundreds of paper-covered playbooks. Briefly, it tells the story of a typical family of thirty years ago, very nicely, and sufficiently amusingly. Mr. O'Neill, if he intended any lesson, probably meant to show how an adolescent boy with poetic tendencies and romanticisms should be treated. The play might be acceptable, certainly far more so than Mr. O'Neill's dark, grim tragedies, except for the bar-room scene with its vile language and open solicitation.

**French Publications.**—"Les Paraboles" (Beauchesne. 24 francs), by Père Denis Buzy, S.C.J., is an explanation of the parables that make up the sixth volume of those learned commentaries on the New Testament that have come under the general title of "Verbum Salutis." Père Buzy, who also is the author of "Introduction aux paraboles évangéliques," published in 1912, has given a very learned and scholarly exegesis. The explanation of the parables is grouped around the idea of the kingdom of God and is divided into two parts. The first part is concerned with the foundation and spread of the kingdom. The second part takes up the duties of the subjects in this kingdom which embraces the duties towards God, towards our neighbor, and towards the creatures of this world.

"Actes des Apôtres" (Beauchesne. 24 francs) is an excellent explanation in French of the Acts of the Apostles by the celebrated Jesuit authority on Pauline theology, Père Boudou. It is a volume of the "Verbum Salutis" series. Père Boudou has given us a scholarly and comprehensive study of the "Acts." This work of some 600 pages reveals his acquaintance with the principle commentaries of St. Paul, both Catholic and non-Catholic. In his explanation and exegesis Père Boudou has had occasion to make many references to the Fathers of the Church, especially St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine.

**Books Received.**—This list is published, without recommendation, for the benefit of our readers. Some of the books will be reviewed in later issues.

BEAST, BIRD AND FISH. Elizabeth Morrow and René D'Harnoncourt. \$1.50. Knopf.  
BROKEN ARROW. Robert Gessner. \$2.00. Farrar and Rinehart.  
CHARACTERS AND COMMENTARIES. Lytton Strachey. \$3.00. Harcourt, Brace.  
CLUE OF THE RIDDLE, THE. Mabel Cleland. \$1.75. Farrar and Rinehart.  
CRÉDIBILITÉ DU DOGME CATHOLIQUE, LA. Joseph Falcon, S.M. 36 francs. Vitte.  
CROWDED HOURS. Alice Roosevelt Longworth. \$3.00. Scribner's.  
DARK GARDEN, THE. Mignon G. Eberhardt. \$2.00. Doubleday, Doran.  
ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES, 1932-1933. \$2.00. National Industrial Conference Board.  
EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY. William A. Kelly. \$2.40. Bruce.  
EMOTIONAL RESPONSES OF CHILDREN TO THE MOTION PICTURE SITUATION, THE. W. S. Dyingier and C. A. Ruckmick. \$2.00. Macmillan.  
GARDEN OF THE PROPHET, THE. Khalil Gibran. \$2.50. Knopf.  
GLEANINGS. Royden S. Bell. \$1.00. Belljock Company.  
GUIDE TO MODERN THOUGHT. C. E. M. Joad. \$1.75. Stokes.  
HANDBOOK OF NRA, A. \$4.50. Federal Codes.  
HEATH READINGS IN THE LITERATURE OF EUROPE. Edited by T. P. Cross and C. H. Slover. \$4.00. Heath.  
HISTORICAL MATERIAL. Lucy Maynard Salmon. \$2.50. Oxford University Press.  
ICARO. Lauro de Bosis. \$3.00. Oxford University Press.  
IN PRAISE OF MARY. Mother Mary Philip. \$1.10. Kenedy.  
INTELLIGENT MAN'S REVIEW OF EUROPE TODAY, THE. G. D. H. Cole and Margaret Cole. \$3.00. Knopf.  
JONATHAN'S DAUGHTER. Lida Larimore. \$2.00. Macrae-Smith.  
KINGDOM COMING. Roark Bradford. \$2.50. Harper.  
LITERATURE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, THE. Julius A. Bewer. \$3.00. Columbia University Press.  
MATHEMATICAL FACTS AND PROCESSES PREREQUISITE TO THE STUDY OF THE CALCULUS. W. H. Fagerstrom. \$1.50. Teachers College, Columbia University.  
MOTION PICTURES AND YOUTH. W. W. Charters. \$1.50. Macmillan.  
NATIONAL RECOVERY PROGRAM, THE. J. D. Magee, W. E. Atkins, and E. Stein. 50 cents. Crofts.  
NEW JERSEY SISTERS OF CHARITY, THE. Sister Mary Agnes Sharkey. \$12.00. Longmans, Green.  
FAST MASTERS AND OTHER PAPERS. Thomas Mann. \$2.50. Knopf.  
SAINT FRANCIS OF ASSISI. Father Aloysius, O.M.Cap. 7/6. Gill.  
SARAH BERNHARDT. G. G. Geller. \$2.75. Stokes.  
SEA WALL. L. A. G. Strong. \$2.50. Knopf.  
SEVEN HUNDRED YEARS. Edited by Joseph M. Vosburgh, O.S.M. *Servite Fathers*.  
TOWARD LIQUOR CONTROL. Raymond B. Fosdick and Albert L. Scott. \$2.00. Harper.  
UNDER THE GOAL POSTS. Eddie Dooley. \$1.25. John Lowell Pratt.  
VANESSA. Hugh Walpole. \$2.50. Doubleday, Doran.

#### Drury Lane's Last Case. Storm King Rides. Renfrew's Long Trail. Peter Abelard.

Although Barnaby Ross has evolved an interesting and complicated plot for "Drury Lane's Last Case" (Viking. \$2.00), the story seems to have run away with him. Perhaps, however, a more satisfactory and less unlikely ending was too difficult of accomplishment. This last case of Drury Lane, the retired Shakespearean actor and now occasional detective, concerns what the author has called "the tragedy of 1499"—the supposed poisoning of Shakespeare. There is spirited and often violent action for the possession of a letter, previously lost to the world, in which Shakespeare had told of his suspicions. Drury Lane (as in the preceding novel) participates actively only toward the conclusion of the story. Inspector Thumm and his daughter, unfortunately, make poor substitutes for Mr. Lane.

"Storm King Rides" (Clode. \$2.00) is another "wild-West" thriller by Galen C. Colin. There have been wild-West stories written before, but never has an author so tried his readers that he asked them to believe in the miracle of the white-haired boy. Storm King is born in a storm and it is in a storm that he ultimately feels his strength. His foster father, Brad, is one of a group of desperadoes who hold up the covered wagon in which his mother and father are trying to find their little home in the wilderness. When Brad discovers that he is one of a gang of ruthless killers, he breaks away, taking the little orphan with him. The bandits are sent up for twenty years, during which time Brad becomes an honest man on the range. Like the elephant who always remembers, the gang decides to make Brad pay for their period of incarceration. From then on the story is for the youngsters who delight in the subtitles of "The Secret Passage," "The Blocked Trail," "The Whisper of Doom," and all the rest of the exciting incidents that make them doubly anxious to finish the story. The author has striven for suspense and he has achieved his aim.

Laurie York Erskine's newest book contains many interesting doings of Major Renfrew, that adventurous member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. "Renfrew's Long Trail" (Appleton-Century. \$2.00), while running smoothly, treats of several disconnected happenings, all thrillingly portrayed, along Renfrew's trail through a few months of service on the Force. They are all exciting and well told, and will appeal to boys of all ages.

Six years ago Helen Waddell brought out "The Wandering Scholars," a learned yet delightful work on the singing clerks and itinerant schoolmen of the early Middle Ages. Now in the more popular form of an historical novel comes her "Peter Abelard" (Holt. \$2.50), in which Heloise, a gifted, impressionable student of seventeen, succumbs to the brilliance and personal charms of her professor, Master Peter, the prince of wandering scholars. Miss Waddell's characters, both historical and invented, are marvelously alive—Abelard towering above the keenest intellects of the day, proud as Lucifer, fuming at the ignorant and narrow prejudices of his contemporaries; Heloise, exultant and glad to suffer any infamy, death itself, rather than thwart her master's ecclesiastical career; and strangely outshining both, the unforgettable Gilles de Vannes, aged, infirm canon of Notre Dame, wise, fearless, tender, their unflinching refuge in every adversity. The incidents of the ages-old story are dramatically and poignantly told with a faultless style and passages of sheer, haunting beauty. But it is the tone of the book that reveals its quality: from first to last it is written in the disconcerting, naturalistic, now outdated fashion of the novelists of the last generation. The most striking feature of the book is the rich historical setting created by the writer's discriminating selections from medieval poetry, philosophy, and theology. She achieves more vivid coloring than that of the elaborate background fashioned by George Moore in his novel of 1921 on the same theme. Historically, however, Miss Waddell's picture is disappointing. Though of a Catholic land, of a vigorous Catholic age, of Catholic characters, lay and cleric of every rank, her picture is distorted, luridly shines with phosphorescent decay, and is utterly devoid of the Catholic spirit.



## Communications

*Letters to ensure publication should not, as a rule, exceed 500 words. The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department. No attention will be paid to anonymous communications.*

### Religion and the Union

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I have heard and considered many arguments against the unionization of labor, but your reasoning in "Religion and the Union" [AMERICA, September 30] against Father Haas' proposal that each working man join a union is unique.

The ultimate reason against organized labor is ever the same: laissez faire is cheaper. It costs more to purchase an article made under decent conditions. It costs more to patronize a union label than it does a sweatshop. These are the reasons it has cost labor so much to make what strides it has. It is futile to preach against birth control and to pay so low a price for an article that it cannot possibly net its producer sufficient money to live in at least mediocre decency and to buy enough food to keep three or four hungry children alive.

Even though no Pope ever wrote an Encyclical against the abuse of robbing the working man of his right—a living wage, decent working conditions and a work day within reason—even though the Church never raised her voice, even though Christianity were yet to come, still there would be written in men's hearts the natural law, of which justice is no mean part. To defraud the laborer of his hire is a sin crying to heaven for vengeance.

We argue plenteously that labor may organize. We never preach that, if labor may organize, capital has a reciprocal duty to patronize organized labor. The Commandments and justice and a peculiar obligation to our fellowmen apply to all vocations—Religious, priests, laity.

The sectarian argument propounded by AMERICA is far-fetched in regard to organized labor. If the union is endeavoring to supply a decent wage so man can have a family, is not organized labor acting morally? If it provides an eight-hour day and perchance a five-day week so the father can teach his children to love God and not be worn out and tired to death when he turns to his parental task, then is not organized labor religious? When labor unions endeavor to build up an *esprit de corps* among their members, penalizing them if they wrong each other, are not, in fostering such standards, labor unions acting justly?

Perhaps employees should gather before and after work for prayer. Some sixty per cent of the members of many unions in New York City are Catholics or fallen-away Catholics, though only one-tenth of one per cent can account for the faith that is in them; so prayer in common might be a fine thing. Supposing AMERICA supply the priests to lead the prayer, as well as to teach these workmen, who often must have been wretchedly trained in the tenets of their Faith, how to answer them. There are many Catholic laymen, I hear somebody state, who, well equipped, would be glad to undertake such a noble task. Our Catholic institutes of higher learning turn out some splendidly equipped mentalities, but will even one in 10,000 perform spiritual works of mercy or any other kind of works without recompense? I wonder.

Or perhaps labor unions are only a second-best arrangement until such time as a course in apologetics forms part of the apprentice curriculum. Fine. But, again I ask, will AMERICA supply the priests or train the laymen who would work gratuitously to handle these ideal tasks? I remember some two years ago, when the curriculum and library and recommended reading list of a certain union apprentice school were most reprehensible. Catholic boys were being bid to read books that were on the index, and the atheistic principal of this apprentice school stated

that no book favorable to the Catholic Church would ever be used. The Catholic who tried to stop this trend of Communism appealed to the regular clergy in whose parish the school was located and to secular clergy. Those to whom appeal was made turned a deaf ear.

Father Haas is right in encouraging every laboring man to join a union. It is a duty. Instead of criticizing the [non-?] sectarianism of organized labor in America, supposing we urge everybody to refrain from buying sweatshop goods, supposing we encourage a little missionary work in instructing labor, supposing the Catholic grammar schools make their Christian doctrine teaching a practical thing, so that when the boy of today becomes the working man of tomorrow he will be a powerful influence against atheism and those obnoxious tendencies which undermine wholesome Catholic life. Such editorials as that in question embitter the laboring man, struggling against starvation. He turns against faith and country. Give labor food and the chance to live with a little respectability, and spirituality may not be so far from organized labor as AMERICA may think.

Brooklyn.

LYDIA AVERY.

[Our correspondent has completely misunderstood the editorial which she criticizes, and which even began: "We quite agree with the Rev. Francis J. Haas, . . . who advises all workers to join a union." Our readers do not need to be reminded that AMERICA has never taken a stand against the rights of labor unions. In also reminding them of the ideal labor union, namely, the Christian one, the "sectarian" argument was not AMERICA's but Pope Leo XIII's, whose "Rerum Novarum" was quoted in this sense in the editorial. Our correspondent's quarrel is with Pope Leo, not with us. Naturally, therefore, with much of what she says on the unions themselves we quite agree, though not with her conclusions. Ed. AMERICA.]

### Negroes and Catholic Schools

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The letter by Dr. Falls published in the issue of AMERICA for October 7 regarding the probably hostile attitude of Negroes in this country on the subject of State aid for Catholic schools during the depression was a good analysis of the situation.

It is undoubtedly true that a large part of the Negro population is unfriendly to the Church because of the discrimination and segregation that is practised by certain Catholic priests, laymen, schools, etc. It is the duty of Catholics all over this country to rectify the situation. A good start could be made by ending the discrimination and segregation that now exists in the admission of colored people to Catholic churches. Also Catholic schools and colleges in this country would greatly help by extending a joint invitation to properly qualified colored students to enter their institutions, where this is not prohibited by law.

New York.

SCHUYLER N. WARREN.

### Church Goods Wanted

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Do you know of any charitable Catholic who would give us one or two used necessary accessories for the church here? All vestments are worn and poor. There are no pyxes for the hosts. We have only one chalice for three altars. If my friends in New York will help a little, I think I'll get the rest.

Le Rose, Serravalle,  
Prov. Arezzo, Italy.

MARIE VAN VORST.

### Appeal

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Will you please ask some of your subscribers to remail their copies of AMERICA to this part of the United States, where Catholic literature is scarce and where so much good can be done for the Faith?

Many patients on the road to recovery would also enjoy a good Catholic book. Magazines and books should be addressed to St. Anthony's Hospital.

Amarillo, Tex.

BARTHOLOMEW O'BRIEN.

## Chronicle

**Home News.**—President Roosevelt on October 20 made public an exchange of cables between himself and Mikhail Kalinin, President of the All Union Central Executive Committee of the U. S. S. R., for a discussion of the questions outstanding between the two countries. Mr. Roosevelt's cable was dated October 10, and M. Kalinin's reply October 17. Maxim Litvinov will represent the Soviet Government in the discussions with President Roosevelt. The announcement coincided with the opening of the farm strike, and it was considered as timed to draw attention from the strike, which on October 25 was active in only three States, Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. In a radio address on October 22, President Roosevelt gave a general résumé of the industrial situation and a review of the Administration's program. He announced that he had authorized the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to establish a Government market for gold newly mined in the United States. If necessary, it could also buy and sell gold on the world market. The purpose was to enable the Government to take control of the industrial value of the dollar. The President said that no value for gold or for the dollar could be fixed until after a rise in commodity prices. The plan was put into effect on October 25, when \$31.36 an ounce was set as the figure at which the RFC would buy gold newly mined in the United States and Territories. This was twenty-seven cents above the world market price. On October 26, the RFC set a price of \$31.54 an ounce, a further increase. On October 23, President Roosevelt signed the retail code, which was effective October 30. It prohibited selling below invoice cost plus an allowance for store wages. The Retail Trade Authority, composed of General Johnson and the chairmen of the Industrial, Labor, and Consumers Advisory Boards, will determine this store-wage allowance. The retail code carried an appendix covering drug stores. On October 23 the President issued an executive order exempting from codes employers in towns of less than 2,500 population employing not more than five persons, and on the 24th another order exempting from code provisions, designed to prevent rebates to favored purchasers, bona fide cooperative organizations whose members receive "patronage dividends." On October 24, he established the procedure for administering the National Recovery Act provisions designed to control imports. On October 25, General Johnson announced the reorganization of the NRA. It will function as four divisions, representing the major classifications of industry, each headed by an administrator, and a fifth, the compliance division, to handle violations of codes, which will be headed temporarily by General Johnson. Also on October 25, George N. Peek announced that the Commodity Credit Corporation would lend farmers fifty cents a bushel on corn in States having Farm Warehouse Acts. As a condition, farmers will be required to accept the Administration's corn-hog produc-

tion control program for 1934. Only five of the nine principal corn-producing States have the required laws—Iowa, Illinois, Minnesota, South Dakota, and Kansas.

**United States Claims Against Soviet.**—According to the latest compilations, claims by the United States and its nationals against Russia, resulting from the repudiation of obligations and the confiscation of property by the Soviet Government following the revolution of November 7, 1917, total approximately \$800,000,000. Of this amount the share of the United States Government is \$332,519,891.37 representing cash advances for war purposes and relief work, with accrued and unpaid interest. Two plans for settling the debt were reported from Moscow. One would be that the Soviet Government refuse to recognize the debts in principle, but would pay an extra percentage in credits which might be devoted by the recipients of the extra percentage to debt liquidation. The other would be an extra cost on new business for the settlement of private claims. The Soviet Government also presents claims of its own as a result of interventionist activities on the part of the United States Government. The latest statement of the State Bank of the Soviet Union, that for July 1, 1933, showed gold holdings of 779,464,520 rubles, equal to \$401,112,253,240; against a note issue of 3,356,253,240 rubles, or approximately \$1,727,127,900 at the par value of the ruble, 51.46 cents. These holdings show an increase over those of 1932.

**Cabinet Crisis in France.**—As was not unexpected, the Government of Premier Daladier fell at the first attempt to pass the new budget imposing severe economies on the nation. The adverse vote, which took place in the early morning of October 24, was 329 to 241. Only his own party, the Radical Socialists, followed the Premier, and the Socialists split in two under M. Renaudel and M. Blum. The break was definite, a large number of Socialists following M. Renaudel into a new party of more moderate tendencies, an event that was sure to have large repercussions in the immediate future of France. The issue behind the vote was the proposal to find economies by cutting the salaries of Government employes, which had always been regarded as untouchable and which thus weathered another storm. The crisis was acute, for a flight of French capital had begun, and a menacing deficit was threatening inflation. For this reason, more than usual haste was made in forming a new cabinet. The problem was not to form a cabinet, however, for many were willing to join one, but to form one that would be able to win a favorable vote, in the present Chamber of Deputies, with its lack of balance between the parties. There was, too, the growing feeling in France that only some sort of dictatorship would be able to pull France out of her difficulties and also face the new dictatorship in Germany. On October 25, Senator Albert Sarraut was asked to form a cabinet, and the next day announced his success. In view of the revolting Socialists' refusal to take office so soon, he had to move further to the Right to seek support. He planned to go before the Chamber



at once on a pure platform of the Radical Socialists, and to ask a vote of confidence on the general question merely of the necessity of economies, so as to be free to work out a concrete plan later on.

**Cuba's Labor Troubles.**—President Grau's student-army Government encountered fresh difficulties during the week when additional strikes were called and labor leaders continued their efforts for bringing about a general strike to paralyze commerce and industry throughout the Island. A railroad strike which tied up traffic in three eastern provinces threatened the whole railway system. Three passenger and two freight trains were derailed, and railway telegraph and telephone lines were cut at a number of points by angry strikers. Though dynamite was used several times, no casualties were reported. In Havana many commercial firms were closed by a twenty-four-hour strike called out of sympathy with the employes of Woolworth's, which closed its branches several weeks ago when unable to reach an agreement with its workers. Police censorship was established over all radios. A policeman was stationed in each broadcasting station to prevent radio criticism of the Grau Government. At the same time, a decree was issued prohibiting the broadcasting of criticism against any firm, Cuban or American, engaged in commerce or industry. The Grau Government continued its vigorous efforts to maintain control and rounded up some 300 Communists and labor agitators. The U.S.S. Wyoming arrived in Havana harbor on October 26 with 645 officers and sailors and 590 marines to relieve the cruiser Richmond which sailed for Key West.

**Japan's Statesmen in Council.**—Much interest was roused in Tokyo by a series of conferences between five members of the Japanese Cabinet who were discussing important questions of domestic and foreign policy. The Japanese press gave considerable space to the meetings of what they called "The Inner Cabinet" or "The Big Five." These officials were Premier Saito, Finance Minister Takahashi, Foreign Minister Hirota, War Minister Araki, and Navy Minister Osumi. They were thought to have considered pro and con the high army and navy estimates for the coming fiscal year and the degree to which they might be reduced by further tact and diplomacy. It was thought that Foreign Minister Hirota had constrained the war leaders to yield to his plan for improving Japan's relations with China, Russia, and the United States. The Soviets' Hishikari documents published in Moscow concerning an alleged plan for the Japanese seizure of the Chinese Eastern Railway were vigorously denounced as "a colossal forgery" by Japanese officials. The next day news of President Roosevelt's message to Kalinin reached Japan and upon the whole was received favorably. President Roosevelt's step did not surprise Japanese officials. Their chief interest was in the manner in which the debt problem would be solved. Japan is Russia's creditor for 300,000,000 yen. Her treaty with Russia provides that she shall receive equal treatment with any other creditor.

**Austria Tightens Reins.**—Chancellor Dollfuss continued to strengthen his position and fortify the Patriotic Front by severe measures against the Nazi and Socialist factions. Many of the leaders were imprisoned, and public demonstrations were stopped. Prince Bernhard von Sachsen-Meiningen and his wife, Princess Margot, were arrested and kept under guard because of an alleged Nazi conspiracy against Austria. The Chancellor also made a strategic move by bringing the Fascist element of the Heimwehr under the immediate control of Vice Chancellor Emil Fey, thus separating Prince Ernst Ruediger von Starhemberg from his command, as the Prince was in open opposition to Major Fey and his policies with the Heimwehr.

**Adjournment of the Disarmament Conference.**—Opinion at Geneva and elsewhere continued to be divided as to the wisdom of adjourning the disarmament conference. The bureau or steering committee of the conference voted on October 25 a recommendation to the general disarmament commission that the conference should be resumed not later than December 4, and that the bureau in the meanwhile should continue the work of the conference. The Americans and the French were reported as desiring that the bureau should do real work. The chief influence for the indefinite postponement of the conference was stated to be the British Admiralty, which looked for parliamentary approval on November 7 of an increased naval building program, whereby Great Britain would follow the lead set by Japan and the United States. Arthur Henderson, president of the conference, expressed his unqualified opposition to the substitution of the Four Power pact for the disarmament convention.

**Germany's Isolation.**—On October 19 Germany formally notified the Secretariat of the League of Nations of her withdrawal from the League. The official document was brief, avoiding statement of reasons which might lead to further debate. Many nations found reasons to excuse Germany for its desperate act, but all deplored this abrupt ending of deliberations necessary to prevent rearmament and dispel the fear of another war. To make its separation from the League complete the German Government resigned its membership in the International Labor Office established by the League. Chancellor Hitler immediately opened a strenuous campaign to secure complete backing in the plebiscite elections set for November 12. While stressing the humiliation of Germany under the Republic and in the Geneva negotiations where Germany was discriminated against as an inferior nation and denied equality, the Chancellor harped continually on Germany's real desire for peace and complete disarmament in all countries. England and Italy seemed to believe that Hitler was sincere in this promise, and even France hesitated to make light of his contentions. The Government's slogan for the election, "Peace and Equal Rights," was broadcast and placarded everywhere. It was thought that only such pivotal leaders as Hitler, Von Papen, and Seldte, with several other important

lieutenants, would be proposed in each of the thirty-six districts with the understanding that Hitler would personally select the remaining members of the new Reichstag supposing, as all conceded, that the vote would be unanimous in his support. Big parades continued to be the order of the day. Over 100,000 workers of all the guilds, with 1,000 floats in a procession nearly seven miles long passed through the streets of Berlin on October 22. On October 24, some 20,000 people jammed the Sportspalast to hear the Chancellor who thrilled the crowds in and out of the enormous hall in a ninety-minute harangue. There was no doubt that he still held the German people in his hand. A circular was issued by Hermann Wilhelm Goering to every Government and police chief in the Prussian province, demanding the greatest care to prevent recurrence of the deplorable attacks made on foreigners, who must not be obliged to give the Nazi salute.

**Trends in Ireland.**—"One thing," said Mr. de Valera a week ago in Limerick, "which they could not afford in this country was the luxury of disturbance." Since those words were uttered the "luxury" of disorder slowly grew throughout the country so that it is now usual wherever members of the newly United Ireland party attempt to hold a public meeting to have some disturbances on a larger or smaller scale. Disorder broke out at the recent convention of the United Ireland party in Tralee where Owen O'Duffy, President of the United Ireland organization, was attacked and beaten. Writing from Ireland our special correspondent reported, "it has now become positively dangerous for any prominent personality of the new party to make any attempt to address meetings in the open, and the Government has come to realize that fact to the extent of sending troops in full warpaint to the scene of any large gathering of the Opposition." Despite much groaning, and some obvious signs of distress, State finances continued to be more than healthy. The total revenue for the first six months of this year amounted to £14,034,007 (as compared with £13,419,460 for the corresponding period last year), and the total expenditure showed £14,946,099 (as compared with £14,452,086). The trade figures for the month of August, 1933, have disclosed a slight increase over those for the corresponding period of 1932. Imports for the month of August, 1933, were valued at £3,244,970, and exports at £1,603,231 leaving an "adverse" balance of £1,641,739, as compared with £1,171,390 for the preceding month. The figures revealed that for the year ended of August 31 last, the total trade had fallen to £55,790,116, as compared with £80,366,644 at the end of August, 1932. This represented a fall of about £25,000,000, or over £8 per head of the total population of the Irish Free State. Not at all discouraged by these figures Mr. Sean Lemass, Minister of Industry of the Irish Free State, outlined on October 23 a program for the industrial development of the country at a meeting of the Dublin Chamber of Commerce. In addition to the three sugar-beet factories now being erected, he proposed plans for the erection of cement plants and factories to manufacture rubber goods of all

varieties. Development of the Irish Free State's mineral resources had been considered as a part of the Minister's program.

**Egypt's Debt Bonds.**—The newly appointed Minister of Finance of the Egyptian Government, Hassan Sabry Bey, on October 21 declared that his Government was determined not to pay the interest coupons on the unified public debt bonds in gold. According to the Government's original agreement with its creditors, the Minister stated that the Government's part in the contract read that "the value of the pound sterling shall be the basis of payment." Since the Egyptian pound is linked to sterling, the British Government had not taken any action to side with France or Italy, the other creditor Powers. It was reported that the creditor Powers could not force payment since the Egyptian Government has abandoned the gold standard.

**Alarms and Hopes for Germany.**—The official notice of Germany's withdrawal from the League of Nations was handed to the League's Secretary, Joseph Avenol, by Baron von Neurath on October 21. The League replied with the same formal notice that had been given to Japan, to the effect that technically Germany remained a member of the League for the next two years. British observers pointed out certain hopeful elements in Germany's attitude. No claim had been made by the Hitler Government for the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine. Germany was willing to adhere to the British draft convention on disarmament of March, 1933, although objecting to its later modifications. She claimed no weapons other than those that would be granted to other nations in the near future. Chancellor Hitler had recently denounced "hurrah patriotism"; and the militant war book by Prof. Ewald Banse, of the Brunswick Technical High School, had been condemned. As a counter-move to the German national plebiscite proposed for November 12, whereby the people's formal approval to Germany's withdrawal was to be secured, a plan was discussed in Geneva for a Council resolution stigmatizing the withdrawal as a threat to world peace. This resolution would receive an international broadcast; thus strengthening the opposition elements in Germany.

So many have wondered at the truth of reports of famine in Russia, that John LaFarge's article, "The Meaning of the Russian Famine," will be very enlightening.

Armistice Day will always bring melancholy memories. John Gibbons next week will throw a light on it in "The Garden at Poperinghe."

What is news, and what isn't? Next week, an experienced reporter, Vincent de Paul Fitzpatrick, will tell in "It Isn't News."

Edythe Helen Browne will devote an article next week to the portrait of a great tragedian of the past, Edwin Booth, whose centenary is celebrated on November 13.